

AN  
ANSWER  
TO THE  
CONSIDERATIONS

Which obliged

PETER MANBY,

Late Dean of *London-Derry* in *Ireland*,

(As he pretends) to EMBRACE, what he calls,

THE

**Catholick Religion!**

---

By *William King*, Chancellor of *St. Patricks*, *Dublin*.

---

Isaiah 1. 2.

-----I have nourished, and brought up Children, and they have  
rebelled against me.

---

L O N D O N,

Printed for *R. Taylor*, near *Stationers-Hall*. 1 6 8 7.





THE  
CONTENTS.

---

Chap. 1. The Examination of his Preface.

SECT. 1. **T**HE Introduction. SECT. 2. Whether Mr. M. really desired the Information? SECT. 3. Catholic Church defined. S. 4. Answer to his first Question, What Church meant by the Catholic? S. 5. To his second Question, Whether the Church of England? S. 6. To his third Question, With what other Church she Communicates? S. 7. To his fourth, Whether the variety of all Protestants be the Catholic Church? S. 8. To his fifth Question, Whether we and Lutherans are the same in all material points? S. 9. Our Church visible before Edward VI. S. 11. His unfair dealing with Dr. Heylin, and Dr. Burnet.

Chap. 2. About Mission.

SECT. 1. His Letter to his Grace the Lord Primate examined. S. 2. The Questions concerning Mission reduced to five Heads. S. 3. The validity of our Orders. S. 5. Answer to his first Question, What Priesthood had the first Reformers, but what they received from Roman Catholic Bishops? S. 6. To his second, Who Authorized them to teach their Protestant Doctrine, &c? S. 7. To his third, Whether Cranmer did condemn the Church of Rome, and by what Authority? S. 8. To his fourth, Whether a Presbyterian can preach against the Church of England by virtue of Orders received from her? S. 9. To his fifth, Whether an Act of

## The Contents.

*Parliament in France, &c. be not as good an Authority for Popery there, as in England for Protestancy?* S. 10. *Mr. M's Objections against the first Reformers considered.* S. 11. *His Objections against Cranmer in particular Answered,* to the end

### Chap. 3. About Confession.

*Sect. 1. Whether We in our Church differ about Confession?*  
S. 2. *The Doctrine of our Church in this matter, whence Confession appears not to be wanting.* S. 3. *His Argument proposed out of St. John 1. 9. compared with John 20. 23.* S. 4. *The words if we Confess, John 1. Ep. 1. 9. shewn not to refer to Auricular Confession.* S. 5. *Gods faithfulness and Justice mentioned John 1. Ep. 1. 9. do not respect particularly the Promise, John 20. 23.* S. 6. *If they did, yet this won'd not prove Auricular Confession.* S. 7. & 8. *His second Argument from the practice of all Ages and Churches considered, and shewn to be false.* S. 9. *His third Argument from the inconveniency that attends the want of Confession.* S. 11. *His fourth Argument from the interest of the Priest.*

### Chap. 4. About the place of the Catholick Church.

*Sect. 1. Answer to his third Difficulty, Where is the Catholick Church?* S. 2. *Whether extant before Cranmer?* S. 3. *Whether Cranmer believed himself a Member thereof?* S. 4, 5. *The Reformation justifiable without charging the Church of Rome with Idolatry.* S. 6, 7, 8. *All Idolatry not inconsistent with the Being of a Church.* S. 9. *The weakness of his Argument brought to prove it.*

### Chap. 5. An Answer to the heap of Particulars thrown together at the latter end of his Paper.

*Se 7. 1. & 2. His endeavour to vindicate his Church in her Devotions.* S. 3. *Whether all elevated and judicious.* S. 4. *His first Answer taken from the Benedicite to Protestant Objections against*

## The Contents.

*gainst Prayers in the Mass directed to Saints. S. 5. The second from the Angels being Favourites. S. 6. The third from their knowing our Affairs. S. 7. His Excuses for the Mass being in an unknown Tongue. S. 8. His Vindication of the Worship of Images, from the Council of Trents forbidding Superstition S. 9. From Kneeling at the Sacrament. S. 10. From Presbyterian Objections against our Practice. S. 11. His Excuse for the ill Practices and Opinions of some Roman Catholicks. S. 12. His recommendation of his Church from her Books of Devotion. S. 13. From the Devotion of her People. S. 14. From the Unity of her Members, that Unity shewed not to be so great as pretended, from the Schisms that have been in her about Ordinations. S. 15. From the Disputes about Confirmation. S. 16. About Confession. S. 17. What he objects against the Church of England, first from her stealing her Communion-Service. S. 18. Secondly, from her want of a due Foundation. S. 19. For trusting Reason too far. S. 20. And contradicting the visible Church. S. 21. Thirdly, Not yielding a due Submission. S. 22. Due Submission shewn to be paid by her to the universal Church, and taught to be due to particular Churches. S. 23. Mr. M's Transcribing and Englisbing Calvin examined together with his Inference. S. 24. Mr. M's Submission to the Catholick and the particular Church whereof he was a Member, examined.*

---

---

The Contents:

for, examined.  
 to the Catholic and the particular Church thereof he was a firm-  
 mind together with his inferiors. S. 24. His Majesty's Submission  
 to the universal Church, and taught to be due to particular Churches  
 a due Submission. S. 22. The Submission should be paid by her  
 contravening the visible Church. S. 27. Thirdly, Not yielding  
 due Submission. S. 29. For trusting Reason too far. S. 20. And  
 ing her Submission-over-ore. S. 18. Secondly, from her want of a  
 it has not only the Church of England, but from her want of  
 the Dissenters and Conventions. S. 16. About Confession. S. 17.  
 the Scriptures that have been in her about Ordinations. S. 14. From  
 Ministers, that Ordinances not to be given at pleasure, from  
 from the Privileges of her Power. S. 14. From the want of her  
 from mention of the Church from her Book of Devotions. S. 13.  
 Position and Opinions of some Roman Catholics. S. 12. His  
 Opposition against our Practice. S. 11. His Excesses for the ill  
 from Reason at the Sacrament. S. 10. From Irregularity  
 from the want of Liberty forbidden by Confession. S. 9.  
 a new ~~James~~ James. S. 8. His Violation of the Majesty of  
 knowing our Affairs. S. 7. His Excesses for the Majesty being in  
 from the Angels being Persecuted. S. 6. The third from their  
 King's Prayers in the Mass directed to Saints. S. 4. The second

---

A N  
**A N S W E R**  
 T O T H E  
**C O N S I D E R A T I O N S**

Which obliged *Peter Manby* Dean of *Derry* to embrace the Communion of the *Romish* Church.

---

C H A P. I.

*To the Preface.*

§ 1. **P**eter Manby Dean of Derry has chosen this time, (for what reasons he knows best) to declare himself of the Communion of the Church of Rome. Whoever doth so in the present circumstances, must run the hazard of being censured, for having too great a value for the Favours and worldly Advantages that some late Converts have met with. In order therefore to satisfy the World that he had some other Reasons besides this prospect (I suppose) he published this Pamphlet that I now answer. Whoever reads it, will find so little Method or Connexion between the parts of it, that he must conclude the Writer was never acquainted with close thinking; and that the looseness and immethodicalness of it, is the greatest trouble lyes on the Answerer: the truth is, it sticks chiefly on Formalities and Preliminaries, which no Advocate ever insisted much upon, that was confident of the merits of his Cause: and therefore to answer it can hardly be worth any ones labour. I confess I should have thought so too, if I had not found some of his own party boasting of it; and I do now assure him that I do not Answer it

out of any apprehension I have of its seducing any of ours; and that it had been answered long ago, if I had been possessed with any such Suspicion.

It consists of three parts, and each of these do in effect contain the same things, and except a man give a distinct Answer to each, he may pretend that part is unanswered. I shall therefore follow him in his own method, and consider, *first*, his Preface to the Reader: *secondly*, the Pamphlet it self: and *thirdly*, his Latine Queries, and beg the Readers Pardon, if he find the Answers sometimes repeated, when Mr. M. repeats the questions so often.

§ 2. His Preface has huddled together some Questions and Dilemma's concerning the Catholick Church, and raised some doubts, concerning which he professes himself to be at a loss, and so desires information——Thus pag. 1. *When a Protestant rebearses this Article of his Creed; I believe one Catholick Church, I would fain understand what Church he means? Again, this makes Protestantcy so wandring and uncertain a thing, that I for my part cannot understand it: Pag. 3. He shall find me pressing for an Answer to such Questions as these.*

Pag. 1. of the Pamphlet, *There are three points wherein I could never satisfie myself; a little after, I could never find any satisfactory Answer to this Question. Pag. 2. pronouncing the Church of Rome Idolatrous, I would fain know by what Authority? — A little after, by whose Authority--- I cannot tell. Pag. 3 there was no Answer to be had. — A little after, I cannot find. l. 9. I do not well understand. l. 15. I could never understand. Pag. 4. I would know. Pag. 7. l. 13. I confess my dullness understands nor. — Pag. 8. line. 16. I would fain know. line 25. Which Answer I confess I do not understand—— pag. 11. line 15. I desire to be informed. l. the last. I cannot imagine. Pag. 12. line 15. I cannot understand.*

Now, if he was so very ignorant as he makes himself, and so desirous of information, he ought to have consulted some of his Spiritual Guides on these heads, and not trusted altogether to his own Judgement; or else he ought in all reason to have printed these Questions, before he resolv'd them unanswerable: for how

did



did he know, but some body might have had more to say to them than he was aware of, and have given him satisfaction: If he had designed to be counted either a prudent or honest man, this had been his method; but I have enquired and cannot find that ever he proposed them seriously to one Divine, or applied himself to any in this weighty affair, before he deserted our Communion; and therefore though perhaps he may be ignorant enough, yet I think it apparent that he only pretends want of understanding, and desire of information; or that he has very little care of his Soul, or of what Communion he is.

§ 3. To give his Questions proposed in his Preface a distinct Answer, I shall first rank them in method.

Concerning therefore the *Catholick Church*, he asks,

1. *What Church we mean?*
2. *Whether the Church of England alone as established by Law, or as in Communion with other Churches?*
3. *With what other Church under Heaven doth the Church of England communicate in Sacraments and Liturgy?*
4. *Whether the variety of Protestants be the Catholick Church, since they want her Essential mark called Unity?*
5. *Whether we and the Lutherans are of the same Church; the Lutherans holding a Corporal Presence in the Sacrament, and we denying it?*

All these we have in the first page of his Preface, and all proceed from the same root, even ignorance of what is meant by the *Catholick Church*: If Mr. *M.* had designed to deal ingenuously and like a Scholar that desired to clear things, (which ought to be the design of every honest writer,) he ought to have laid down a definition of the *Catholick Church*, and then examined to whom it belonged, and shewn the Church as established here by Law to be no part of it; for, till that be done, all that is said is banter; for we mean not the same thing by the Church. I never saw any Romanist take this method, and therefore I have always believed that they rather designed to gain Profelytes by confounding their Heads, than by clear Reason and Information;



I will therefore tell him what I mean by the one Catholick Church in the Creed; and if he do not like the description, let him mend it.

The Catholick Church is the whole body of men, professing the Religion of Christ, and living under their lawful Spiritual Governours. This body of Christians is one, because it has, according to St. *Paul Ephes. 4. 5. one Lord, one Faith, one*

*Multæ gentes, modo una gens, quare una gens? quia una fides, quia una spes, quia una charitas, quia una expectatio; postremo quare non una gens, si una patria? patria celestis est. S. August. tom. 8. in Psalm. 85.*

*Baptism, one God, and according to Saint Augustine, many Churches are one Church, because there is one Faith, one Hope, one Charity, one Expectation; and lastly, one heavenly Country; now if he had been as*

*much concerned to understand this aright, as he would have his Dear Reader, he might easily have seen who it is that fancy to themselves a Church divided from all the rest of the world, by breaking the bonds of Charity, and coining new Articles, distinct from those of the Catholick Faith, which we received from Christ and his Apostles; and that the Answers to his Questions are very easie.*

§. 4. For to the First, when he would know *what Church we mean when we rehearse that Article of our Creed, I*

Pag. 1.  
Pref.

*believe one holy Catholick and Apostolick Church? the*

Answer is, that we mean, not any particular Church, nor any party of Christians of any one denomination; but all those that hold the Catholick Faith, and live under their lawful Pastors: while they have those marks I have laid down from the Scripture and St. *Augustine*, they are still of one Communion, though by the peevishness and mistake of their Governours, they may be engaged in Quarrels; as the Church of *Rome* was in St. *Cyprians* time with the Church of *Africa*, about the allowing the Baptism of Hereticks; and the Quarrel came to that height, that when the *Africans* came to *Rome*, not only the peace of the Church and Communion was denyed them, but even the common kindness of Hospitality; as we may see in *Fir-*

*milians.*

*milians* Epistle to Saint *Cyprian*, Ep. 75. This being supposed, it is no hard matter to find out the parts of this Catholick Church where-ever one comes, it is only Examining whether any Church hold the Catholick Faith, and whether they live under their lawful Governours; and so far as they do so, it is our duty to joyn with them, as true parts thereof. Whereas he who with the Donatists, will unchurch three parts of four of the Christian World; or fancy a Church divided from all others, though as sound in Faith and as obedient to their Governours as possible; is like for ever to be *tossed too and fro upon the unstable waters of Schism*, and *dwindles the Church into a Faction*; and this gives a full Answer.

Preciperet fraternitati universæ, ne quis eos in domum suam reciperet, & venientibus non solum pax & communio, sed etiam sectum & hospitium negaretur. *Cyprian*. Ep. 75.

§ 5. To his second Question, *whether we mean by the Catholick Church, the Church of England alone, or the Church of England as in Communion with other Churches*; for by this it appears, that the Churches of *England* and *Ireland* are no more the Catholick Church, than the *English Seas* are the whole Ocean; but they are a part thereof, because they hold the Catholick Faith intirely, and are governed by their lawful and Catholick Bishops, who have not had for many years, so much as a Rival appearing to contest their Title and Succession.

§ 6. But then he urges in the third place, *with what other Church doth the Church of England Communicate in Sacraments and Liturgy?*

To which I answer, Unity of Liturgy is no part of Communion of Churches; let him shew, if he can, that the Catholick Church ever had any such Unity; Unity in Faith, Sacraments & in worshipping God she has with all true Churches on the face of the Earth, insomuch that there is not one Article in her Creeds, nor one Petition in her Liturgy, that even Mr. *M.* can condemn; nor is there any Office wanting, in which the Ancient Liturgies agreed; and then let him shew why all Churches hold not Communion with her? and who is guilty of the breach thereof? If he

say

say that we hold indeed the Catholick Faith, but not intire, let him make it appear: but if he cannot prove that we deny any part of this Catholick Faith, he acquits us from Heresie, and owns our union in Faith with the Catholick Church. To prove this defect was chiefly incumbent on him, but he has not so much as attempted it. He has indeed made an attempt against the lawfulness of our Governours, that is, to prove us Schismatics; but how unsuccessfully we shall see by and by.

§. 7. In the mean time to his fourth Demand, Whether by the *one Catholick Church be understood the variety of all Protestants, since they want her essential mark, even Unity?* I answer, that neither all Protestants are Catholick members of the Church, nor are Protestants only; those amongst Protestants, that embrace the Catholick Faith, and make no Separation from their lawful Governours, and that live in unity of Faith and charity with their neighbour Churches are Catholick members, and have that Unity, which is essential to the Catholick Church; but these are not to be confounded with *Presbyterians, Independants, Anabaptists, Fifth Monarchy-men, Quakers, &c.* since these have separated themselves from their lawful Governours, as much as Mr. M. himself; though their Crime be less than his: as he is less guilty that makes a Rebellion, than he who joyns with a Foreigner to enslave his native Countrey.

But he has an Excuse even for these, that he has heard out of the mouths of some Protestants, that God had his people amongst all sorts of Protestants; and what if some charitable people say with Saint Augustine; that they who defend their Opinion, though false and perverse without pertinaciousness, especially when they were not the Authors thereof, through their own confidence and presumption but received it from their seduced and erring Parents, and seek industriously the truth, and are ready to embrace it when they find

Qui Sententiam suam quamvis falsam atque perversam nulla pertinaci animositate defendunt, præsertim quam non audacia præsumptionis suæ pepererunt, sed à seductis atque in errorem lapsis parentibus acceperunt, querunt autem cauta sollicitudine veritatem, corrigi parati cum invenerint, nequaquam sunt inter Hæreticos deputandi. August. Ep. 162.

*find it; are not at all to be reckoned Hereticks?* is he sure that there are not some such amongst every sort of Protestants, nay of Christians? I am sure, the passage he quotes out of the *second Paper* mentioned by him, is no Confutation of this; nor any thing to the purpose, except he hath a mind to prove the Words true by his own example: For, what Reason has he given why he quitted the Church in which he was baptized, educated and preferred (whether above his Deserts, let the World judge by this Paper;) but *because the Discipline and Devotions of the Church of Rome suit his present Fancy better than what he left*; because he was not able to answer some few Questions that have no great difficulty in them, his private Judgment or Interest told him he ought to change his Church. And if he changed his Church on the confidence of a Judgment he acknowledges sufficiently weak, why will he not allow the same liberty to others? If he say that the Church he has chosen is a Church from whence there *can be no appeal*; I answer, he has only his own Judgment for believing so; and when that Judgment alters, he may be of any other Church, and so he is fallen in spite of his endeavours into the same mistake he would avoid. He brings in (to what purpose he knows perhaps himself) a Story of a passionate Presbyterian, who said, that *he cared not what his Son was, so he was not a Papist*: which may pass for a Reason to those that build their Faith on Stories and Legends, and use to give the Character of their Enemies only from their peevish Sayings, but is nothing to our Church.

He argues against Schism, from *1 Cor. 1. 10. I beseech you brethren that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no Schisms among you*: as if the Church of which he pretended to be a Member did not abhor Schism as much as he; and as if the first Schism from her Communion had not been by Papists about the *10th of Queen Elizabeth*. Now the same *St. Paul, 1 Cor. 6. 18.* advises them to *flee fornication*, and that as a thing contrary to our Union with God: *Mr. M.* had best try his Logick, and see if he can from the first place, which forbids Schism, prove that it makes

makes a Man more cease to be a Member of the Church than Fornication doth, which is forbidden in the second.

He produces out of *Romans* 15. 6. *that ye glorifie God with one Mind and one Mouth*, to prove that we ought not only *say the same things, but the same words, especially about Sacraments and Liturgy, for by one Spirit we* (meaning all Christians) *are Baptized into one body*; therefore he exhorts them to take heed of such Teachers as have no mission or authority for what they say, but only good words and fair speeches to deceive the hearts of the simple. By the *for* and therefore in this sentence one would expect that one part should be a consequence of another, but there is not the least affinity between them: but you must excuse him, for his talent never lay much, as has been observed by his Friends, in drawing consequences.

Those, that by *good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple*, are not said to want Mission, *Rom.* 16. 17. it is probable therefore they had it; but *St. Paul* gives very different marks to know them by, even teaching contrary to the Doctrine they had already received, serving their own bellies — not our Lord Jesus. Nonconformity therefore to the Doctrine taught by the Apostles, and too eager a concern for the riches and interest of the Clergy are the signs of a false Teacher, though he have never so Authentick Mission, according to *St. Paul*, nay, though he were an Angel from Heaven. But if he had been of *Mr. M's* opinion, the *Romans* must not have judged of their Pastours, or attempted to discover Seducers by their Doctrine, but only by calling for their Letters of Orders and Titles from the Apostles.

§. 8. His fifth Question concerning the Catholick Church is, *whether we and the Lutherans are the same in all material points; the Lutherans holding a corporal Presence in the Sacrament, and we denying it?* to which I answer, that a difference may be material, and yet not essential to Faith, so as to necessitate a division of Church Unity; there is a very material difference between those in the Church of *Rome* that hold the deposing Power, and those that deny it; between those that hold the Pope infallible, and those



those that deny it, & so in many other points, as material as those in dispute between Protestant Churches; yet, inasmuch as they are not reckoned by all to be the Essentials of Faith, they do not break Communion; and indeed, he understands very little that knows not there may be difference of understanding about matters relating to Sacraments, and yet Unity of Communion. As to his Objection against the Calvinists, that *they have no Order of Priests or Bishops*, I leave him to dispute it with them. Whether consequently they *have no true Sacraments*, which he infers, I leave him to dispute it with his new Church, which allows their Baptism; we are concerned in neither.

§. 9. There is only one thing more he objects on this Head against our Church, and that is, that she, as established by Law, is *Catholick neither as to time nor place*, because not *visible any where for many Ages before Edward the sixth*. This is the old Question, *Where was your Church before Luther?* And has been often answered, by shewing that we made no new Church by the Reformation, that we kept all the Essentials of Faith & Worship received by our Ancestors, had the same Creeds, the same God, Christ, Baptism, and Eucharist; and lastly, were governed by the same Bishops and other Governours, before and after the Reformation; and therefore it is a wild thought in Mr. M. to affirm that our Church was not visible before *Edward the sixth*. It is true, it was not established by Law in all points as it is now, no more was the Church of *Rome* before the Reformation by the Council of *Trent*, (for that also pretended to Reform) but the establishing by Law is accidental altogether to a Church, and a Church may be visible long before it is so established.

This is all in his Preface that any way relates to the Catholic Church.

§. 10. The second part relates to the Mission of our Bishops, and is reduced to four Queries, which shall have their full Consideration, when I come to consider the first point that he lays down in his Book.

§. 11. The rest is spent in comparing two Historians of the Reformation, that is Doctor *Heylin* and Doctor *Burnet*, of whom

he gives this Character, that *Burnet strains all his wit to palliate the doings of the Reformers, and paint them out to advantage; Heylin represents them honestly for the most part, and in their own colours*: Whereas in truth the first doth generally lay down naked matter of Fact only, and leaves the Reader to judge; and the other passes his own Censures, and gives his own Gloss on them; as may be seen by the very passages Mr. M. quotes out of Doctor *Heylin's* Preface. The truth is he abuses both Historians; *Heylin* by producing that for matter of Fact, which is all his own Inferences and Conjectures, and so exprest to be in the very words: *all that was done in order to a Reformation, seemed to be accidental only, then-----I cannot reckon his Death an infelicity, -----it is not to be thought, to the next clause, nor was it like to happen, to the next-----might easily have done, to the next-----was in all probability to the last.*

Are not these Conjectures strong Arguments to prove the Reformation unjustifiable? But he abuses him yet more in the passage concerning the Duke of *Sommerset*, by reporting that as Doctor *Heylin's* Opinion, which he records only as the Opinion of others, pag. 116. of his History; where among three or four Conjectures, why the Duke did not claim the benefit of his Clergy; he sets down this last, *Finally whether it were some secret judgment on him from above (as some men conceived) that he, who had destroyed so many Churches, &c. should want the benefit of Clergy in his greatest extremity*; where Mr. M. leaves out the Parenthesis (*as some Men conceived*) and falsifies him (perhaps to make him recompence) by adding another of his own, *he (the Duke of Sommerset) deprived many learned men of their means and livelihood, (for being Papists adds Mr. M.) a most notorious falsehood*; since it appears from all Histories of the Reformation, that there was an universal Compliance of the Clergy; few making any Opposition, and none almost absolutely refusing Conformity; his Papists at that time loved their Means so well, or found so little amiss in the Reformation, that they readily complied with all Changes. And as he thus abuses and falsifies *Heylin*, so he doth *Burnet*; he saith, that

the



the worst Burnet can charge Heylin with, is his not vouching Authority for what he says; and he affirms, that it is an untruth, that Heylin writ upon uncertain grounds, as Burnet would insinuate. But Burnet in that place insinuates no such thing; but only says he ought to have vouch'd them, that people might have judg'd of their certainty. Heylin's own Testimony for his fidelity is not to be taken in his own Cause; and therefore Mr. M. vindicates him very ill, when he produces nothing else for him. He saith Doctor Burnet doth not produce one instance of any moment, wherein he dares say, Doctor Heylin is false. I hope Mr. M. would not quote any passage out of Heylin that was not of moment; what if that passage that relates to the Duke of Sommerfet here quoted, be recorded falsely by Heylin, and taxt as false by Burnet? then I believe every body will judge Mr. M. either very ignorant or very malicious; and yet thus it is. Says Mr. M. from Heylin, The Duke of Sommerfet was so defective in his Judgment, as not to crave the benefit of his Clergy, which might have saved his Life. Now look into Burnet ad Ann. 1531. pag. 186. 2 vol. and see whether he have not these words, Some late Writers have made an Inference upon his not claiming the benefit of Clergy, that he was thus left of God; not to plead that benefit; since he had so much invaded the Rights and Revenues of the Church; but in this they shew'd their Ignorance; for by the Statute, That Felony, of which he was found Guilty, was not to be purg'd by Clergy.

The most likely excuse I can make for Mr. M. is, that he neither read Burnet nor Heylin; if he did, he neither knew this, and conceal'd it; which makes him very disingenuous: or did not observe it; and so he falls under the Character of a thoughtless Reader, that could neither by his own Observation, nor the Admonition of Friends avoid picking out, and repeating such an uncharitable falshood. It were easie to shew several falshoods (even in those things that are most invidious to the Reformation) in Heylin's History, observed and confuted by Burnet: one more particularly, in his saying, that the Father of Queen Ann Boleyn was one of the Jury that condemn'd her; with which, as a falshood,

he taxes *Heylin* in his *Addenda*, p. 363. first Volume, where he says, that Doctor *Heylin* took this, as he did many other things, too easily upon *Sanders's* credit; which (if true) is enough to blast the credit of his Book with all Protestants, nay with all Men of Judgment that know what an infamous Liar and Rebel *Sanders* was.

Whereas therefore he intreats the Protestant Reader to peruse Doctor *Heylin's* History of the Reformation, we are content he should do so; and let him at the same time peruse the History of the Council of *Trent*, written by Father *Paul*, and let him impartially judge which was carried on by the worst Men and worst Arts; the Reformation, or the Council.

What Mr. *M.* objects further in his Preface against *Cranmer* and the other Reformers, shall be considered in its proper place.

## C H A P. II.

**I** Come now to examin the Pamphlet it self, which consists of Three parts.

1. A Letter to His Grace the Lord Primate of *Ireland*.

2. Of Three points wherein he could not satisfie himself.

And 3dly. A confused heap of particulars at the latter end.

As to the Letter; it is a little ambiguous to whom it is directed; if to his old Patron, as a civil Compliment at taking leave, he had done well to have told the true Reason why he forsook him. Your Grace would not get me a Bishoprick, though often prest and solicited by me; therefore I beg your leave to seek a new Patron, whose Mediation may be more effectual. But perhaps Mr. *M.* means another man, and then we may reckon this as the first Fruits of his Conversion. Are you taught already the Art of Equivocation? We shall learn from this what sincerity we may expect from you; and shall hardly believe you when you tell us that it was not any consideration of Temporal Interest inclined you to be reconciled. If you valued Temporal Interest so little, why were you so earnest for a Protestant Bishoprick? Why did you repine and murmur so much that you were not preferred? Why did

did you declare to several about a year ago, that you was no Roman Catholick, but yet would not appear against the Church of *Rome*, because you hoped to rise by help of Roman Catholicks? Why did you endeavour to ingratiate your self by mean Arts and condescend even to the Office of an Informer? Why did you defer publishing this Paper (such as it is) which was ready sometime before, till you thought you might be sure of keeping the Profits of your Deanery? Either you are a Lay or Clergy-man? If a Lay-man; are not you abominably Sacrilegious, to have possessed and still retain the Revenue of a Clergy-man? Why do you retain the Title of Dean in the Frontispiece of a Book, which is designed to prove you to be no Priest, and consequently incapable of it? If your Orders had yielded you as much *per annum* as your Deanery doth, Have we not reason to believe, you would no more have renounced the one than the other? For shame, resign our Church her own, since you have deserted her, or never talk of Conscience; Till this be done, it is in vain for you to pretend that your having reflected on the uncertainty and variety of the Protestant Spirit, or perused Catholick Books have undeceived you. Did you never reflect on the uncertainty or variety of the Protestant Spirit before, that it should have such a mighty influence on you just at this time? sure there was greater variety when you was first educated in the Colledge, and when you first entred into Orders than now. They talk'd much of the Spirit then, and you yet retain their language; if instead of that Cant you had well studied and considered the Principles of the Church which you have left, you would have found that there neither are nor can be any more certain and steady Principles of any Religion, than hers are. You make your self a great Novice, that at this time a day pretend to be converted by *perusing the Mass*. In good earnest, did you never read it before? if you did, how comes it to have such influence on you in King *James the Second's* time, and so little in King *Charles the Second's*? All you pretend for your self is, that you were then under Prejudice, and deceived by false Reports, concerning (that you call) the Catholick Religion; that is, The Reverend Dean

Dean after near 30 years study had his Religion by hear-says, wanted Honesty to be impartial, and either Industry or Means to inform himself concerning the most material Controversies that are on foot in the Church. Which Controversies are still the same, and the Arguments *pro* and *con* of the same force they were before in every thing, except the alteration of one circumstance that is, worldly Advantage. Is not this a most excellent Account of your Conversion? And whereas you tell His Grace, that *all that have known you these several years can witness for you, that it was not any consideration of worldly Interest that inclined you*; you are obliged to beg His Graces pardon for your false Information: for, I can assure you, I have consulted many that have known you, and have not met one that can witness this for you. But on the contrary, the most conclude, that it was the little grain of Worldly Advantage turn'd the Scale for your new Church. This is therefore the true Account you ought to have given His Grace of your *Reconcilement*.

§. 2. The second part of Mr. M's Paper consists of three points, wherein he professes, that *he could never satisfy himself since he began to study the Controversies between the two Churches.*

The first was, *The Mission or Authority of the first Reformers.*

The second, *The Want of Confession in the Church of England.*

And the third, *Where is that one holy Catholick Church we do profess to believe in the two Creeds?*

To the first of these points I shall reply in this method.

1. I will put together all the Questions that he asks on this Head.

2. Consider the Answers he produces to them.

And 3. The Objections he has raised against the Reformation or Reformers.

1. Concerning our Mission he asks in his Preface, pag. 3. *What Priesthood or Holy Orders had the first Reformers, but what they received from the hands of Roman Catholick Bishops?*

*What Priesthood or Holy Orders have Protestants, but what they confess to have received from Roman Catholick Bishops?* Pag. 12.

of the Pamphlet.

2. Who

2. *Who authorized the first Reformers to preach their Protestant Doctrine, and administer their Protestant Sacraments?* Pag. 1. of his Pamphlet.

*I am not now disputing what Doctrine he preached, but who sent him to preach his Protestant Doctrine, and administer his Protestant Sacraments?* 'Tis not his Doctrine, but Mission I am now enquiring after. Pag. 3.

3. *Whether Cranmer and his Associates could condemn the Church of Rome by pretence of the Mission they received from her Bishops?* Pag. 3. of his Preface.

*I understand not-----how any man can justifie his Protestant Doctrine by authority of the Popish Mission.* Pag. 2. of his Pamphlet.

*I must still ask the old Question; By whose Authority did he condemn that Church, from whom he received his Mission?* Pag. 3. of his Pamphlet.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury, &c. at the time of their Consecration were professed Roman Catholicks-----But afterwards turning Protestants, and pronouncing the Church of Rome Idolatrous, I would fain know by whose Authority?* Pag. 2. of his Pamphlet.

*At the time of their Consecration they professed Seven Sacraments, Anno 1536. they retrencht them to three-----then to two, Anno 1549.-----By whose Authority or Mission I cannot tell.* Ibid. pag. 2.

*Again, Who gave them Authority to pronounce themselves sound Members, and the Church of Rome a corrupt Arm of the Catholick Church?* Pag. 12.

The fourth Sett of Questions concerning Mission is on this Head; Preface, p. 3 *Whether a Presbyterian Minister having received Orders from a Protestant Bishop, can, by virtue of such Orders, pronounce the Church of England a corrupt Church?*

*I understand not how a man can forsake the Church of England, and preach Presbyterian Doctrine by virtue of his Protestant Orders.* Pag. 2. of his Pamphlet.

*Presbyterians being Interrogated,-----Did that Church authorize you to preach against the Sacraments or Liturgy? there was no Answer to be had.* Pag. 3.

Ibid.



I desire to know, whether an honest man can preach against the Liturgy, Sacraments, or Constitution of any Church, by vertue of any Commission he received from it? Ibid.

So that no honest man can turn Presbyterian or Independant Preacher by vertue of his Protestant Mission. p. 4.

The fifth Sett of Questions relating to Mission is, Pref. pag. 3. Whether an Act of Parliament in France, Spain or Germany, be not as good an Authority for Popery there, as in England for Protestantism?

A Parliamentary Mission then our first Reformers had, and no other that I can find. p. 3.

§. 3. Before I come to a distinct consideration of each of these, I must observe that he wayes the Dispute concerning our Priestly or Episcopal Orders, whether valid or no; (Pamphl. pag. 1.) Now, if these are valid, either let him shew one Sacrament administered by Protestants, which these Characters do not give them Power to celebrate: or one Article of Faith that they teach, which the same do not oblige them to teach: or else let him ask no more for their Mission, and Authority, to teach their Doctrine and administer their Sacraments. If their Doctrine and Sacraments are not *Theirs* but *Christs*; they are not only sent, but obliged by their Orders to administer the one, and teach the other, in the Churches wherein they are appointed Pastors.

I observe further, that he manifestly contradicts himself in this matter; for he makes *Cranmer* and *Latimer* the first Protestant Bishops and owns their Consecration (p. 2.) and yet alledges (p. 3.) that it is no easie matter to find out who consecrated the first Protestant Bishops; because, forsooth, there were none to do it, but *Roman Catholick Bishops*, who never use to consecrate any Protestants. But if he had read *Mason*, and Archbishop *Bramhall*, he might have seen who ordained the first Reformers, and their Succession to this day: and if he had consulted Sir *James Ware de Prasulibus*, he might have seen that there wanted not Bishops in Ireland willing to consecrate Protestants; Primate *Loftus* being consecrated by the then Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. *Curwin*, who continued

tinued in his Archiepiscopal See near six years after, and then by reason of his great Age was translated to the Bishoprick of *Oxford* at his own desire. *Antiquit. Oxon. de Aede Christi. lib. 2. p. 291. Ware de Praesulibus. Lib. in Archiepiscopis Dubliniensibus, p. 129.*

Nor is the Testimony he produces out of *Burnes* from *Queen Mary* at all pertinent; all that appears from that Testimony is, that they who were ordained according to the Form in our Common-Prayer-Books are not lookt upon by the Queen *so be ordered in every Deed*, but there is no reason alledged for it, nor indeed can any be given, but because it was not done according to the Pontifical; an ignorance excusable at that time, when perhaps she was informed that something Essential was left out in our Form of Orders, or that the Pontifical with its Tricks was not a new thing; whereas our Form of Ordination is more full then any of the ancient Forms, both in Substance and Ceremony; and therefore either the ancient Priests and Bishops had no sufficient Ordination, or *Queen Mary* was mis-informed when she did not reckon Ordination by the Common-prayer-book *ordering indeed*.

§. 5. Having premised this, I answer to his first Question, *What Priesthood or holy Orders had the first Reformers, but what they confess to have received from Roman Catholick Bishops?* If he mean by Roman Catholick Bishops, such as own'd the Bishop of *Rome* to be the supream universal Pastor of the Catholick Church by Divine right, to whom themselves were by God made unappealably accountable, which is the Essential Character of a *Roman Catholick*; the first Reformers received their Orders from no such Roman Catholicks. Whatever Roman Catholicks hold now, he will never prove this to have been the declared sence of the Church of *England* before the Reformation: and therefore the first Reformers cannot properly be said to have received their Orders from Roman Catholicks, but from the Church of *England*.

There are two things to be distinguished in the Office of a Bishop; one is, the Power or Capacity of governing the Church, interpreting Scripture, Consecrating other Bishops, Ordaining Priests and Deacons, Offering, Baptizing, and Confirming: the  
D other



other is, the admitting the Bishop so impowered to the exercise of that Power within certain Limits, which we call a Diocess. The first of these is a Divine, and the second a Canonical Right. Now the first Reformers received the first of these, that is, their Orders from Christ, by the hands of their Consecrators, who were Bishops of *England*, for *Rome*. The second of these they received likewise from the Laws and Constitutions of the Church and Kingdom of *England*, of *Rome*: And it is to be observed that the Laws of the one were directly contrary to the Laws of the other, and that the Bishops of *England* had their proper and immediate Mission to their Churches by an Authority maintained in opposition to the Popes Power, which he endeavoured as much as he could to abolish, but was not able; as may be seen in his Contest with *Chicheley*, Archbishop of *Canterbury* in *Henry* the Sixth's time. Although therefore the first Reformers had their Orders from Bishops in Communion with the Church of *Rome*; yet it was as Christian Bishops they Ordained, and as English Bishops that they admitted the first Reformers to their Charges.

But suppose they had no other Orders but what they received from the Bishop of *Rome* himself; all that can be concluded from thence is, that we are obliged to own, that the Orders of Priest and Bishop given by Roman Catholicks are valid, and capacitate a man to perform all the Duties belonging to those Offices in a Christian Church, which we readily acknowledge, and charge the Popish Priests and Bishops not with want of Orders, but with abusing the Orders they have, to ill intents and purposes: The Roman Catholick Bishops do not confer Orders as Roman, but Christian Bishops their Orders are Christian Orders, and those we hold sufficient to all intents and purposes of the Reformation, and must do so, till Mr. *M.* or some body else prove them insufficient.

He objects, pag. 2. *That the first Reformers were Ordained Roman Catholick Bishops, and made themselves Protestants*, which proceeds on an ignorant supposition, that every man is ordained to preach the Tenents of his Ordainers, or else must have no

Missi-

Mission : whereas the Ordainers are only Instruments, but the Power is from Christ; and they are no more accountable to their Ordainers upon the account of being Ordained by them, then a man is accountable to a Lord Chancellor for the use of his Power, because he set the Seal to his Patent by which he claims his Power. In short, a man is Ordained neither a Protestant nor a Papist, but a Christian Bishop ; his Mission is a Christian Mission, let him be sent by whom he will ; and whoever gave him his Mission, if he teach any Doctrine but Christs, he is accursed. Hence when the *Donatists* were very earnest to know the Ordainers of St. *Augustine* and other Catholick Bishops, they answer, *We are not satisfied how the cause of Truth is concerned, who was the Ordainer of any one ; since God is shewn to be our Father.* And when they press still to know the Ordainers, St. *Augustine* answers, *I see they insist on trifles.*

'Twas on this Principle that Baptism and Ordination by Hereticks were allowed in the Catholick Church, to such as came ever from those Hereticks, even because they were Baptized Christian Proselytes, and Ordained Christian Bishops ; and they were never thought to go beyond their Mission, because they renounced the Errors of their Ordainers.

If it be replied, that Hereticks making themselves, of Hereticks, Catholick Bishops, change for the better; but Papists making themselves Protestant Bishops, change for the worse. I answer, this quits the Plea of Mission, and brings the Mission to the trial of the Doctrine. If then *Cranmer* and the rest of the Roman Catholick Bishops made themselves only truly Catholicks ; they made themselves nothing but what Christ had obliged them to in their Consecration. He is the Father of Truth; the Children of Truth are owned by him as *honestly begotten, and no By-blows*, as Mr. M. would insinuate, p. 2. in which he has exactly transcribed not only the Argument of the Donatist *Petilian* against the Catholicks, but

Tandem aliquando  
expressus dicat, utrum  
patris loco habeant  
Cæcilianum, ex quo  
deducta est ista proge-  
nies, non enim potest  
aliqua res sine genera-  
tore suo nasci, aut sine

capite incipere, aut sine radice sua crescere. Videt igitur Nobilitas tua se originem non habere sæpius potestatum si igitur originem non habet, ipse est magis Hæreticus, qui non habet patrem, qui habuit patrem iudicio suo damnavit. Aspuletur igitur, ut si criminiosum patrem ejus constituerit, eum crimina teneant; si autem innocentem, necesse habeat esse filius innocentis. *Coll. Carib. 3. Scd. 236.*

his very words, The true Question is there-  
fore, whether *Cramer* and the first Reformers  
embraced and vindicated the Truth in their  
Changes; and let him joyn issue on this Point  
when he pleases, we are ready to answer him.

§. 6. To his second Question, *Who authorized the first Reformers to Teach their Protestant Doctrine, and Administer their Protestant Sacraments?*

I Answer, No body but himself would have asked such a foolish Question; since the Protestants pretend to no Doctrine or Sacraments peculiar to themselves, or that may be called Theirs, but only to the Doctrine & Sacraments of Christ received in the Catholick Church: If the Protestants were guilty of any fault, it was not making new Doctrines or Sacraments, but rejecting those that some counted old; and so their Crime was not the wanting Mission or Authority to do what they did, but not using their Authority to its full extent, to do and teach more: If they had power given them to Administer seven Sacraments, and administered only two, as Mr. *M.* says, then it is a foolish thing to doubt their Authority to Minister those two; whereas they are rather accountable for their not Holding and Administring the other five: but the truth is, they received in their Ordination power from Christ, to administer neither Protestant nor Popish, but Christian Sacraments; and Mr. *M.* neither has, nor can make it appear, that they Administer any other, or omit any that Christ has commanded.

He is aware of this Answer in his fifth Page, and gives a reply to it; *I pray* (saith he) *the Reader to remember that this was the very Answer of Luther, Socinus, Zuinglius, Calvin, and most other Reformers*: Let me pray the Reader to observe, that this is nothing  
to

to the purpose, if it were true ; since we are not to believe every Spirit, but try the Spirits whether they be of God. The false Prophets pretended to Revelation as well as the true, was neither therefore to be believed ? the false Reformers, as well as the true, pretended to preach no new Doctrine, or administer new Sacraments, but only the Doctrine and Sacraments of Jesus Christ : Are neither therefore in the right ? May not a good Answer be abused and misapplied ? To clear therefore this matter, we own what he contends for, *that both true Doctrine and external and lawful Mission are generally necessary to a regular preacher of the Gospel*, pag. 5. and if either of these are wanting, the person is not to be received. Which appears in the Prophets he mentions from *Jer. 23. ibid.* who wanted not an external Mission, whatever Mr. M. imagines ; for the Prophets are the Pastors of the people, against whom God pronounces a Woe, *verse 1. and 2.* of that Chapter ; they are joyned with the Priests, *verse the 11. and 34.* and their fault was not preaching without any Mission at all, but preaching false Doctrine ; for which no man can have a Mission, but even the Pope himself when he doth so, is to be rejected as a Seducer. If these very Prophets whom Mr. M. imagines to have had no Mission had taught true Doctrine, God would have approved them, *verse 22. But if they had stood in my Council, and caused my people to hear my words, then they should have turned them from their evil ways* ; that is, God would have given them success : and when God says, *verse 32. I sent them not, nor commanded them*, it doth not relate to preaching, for God had commanded the Priests and Prophets to preach ; but it relates to the causing *my people to err by their Lyes and Lightness*, which is a good Argument against those that seduce the people with Legends and Lyes, and Revelations, and false Miracles, and Doctrines of Profit and Gain, whatever their Mission be.

Now these two things being necessary to a true Teacher, we affirm, that the first Reformers in England had both ; not only the *Licence and Approbation of the Church* as he states it, *pag. 15.* but her Ordination & Appointment also according to the known rules

rules of constituting Pastors, which some other Reformers do not pretend to; and therefore all the Question is, concerning the other Character of a true Pastor, preaching true Doctrine. If the first Reformers had preached *Popish Doctrine* and administered *Popish Sacraments*, I do not find but Mr. M. would have thought they had Mission enough: but I Answer, that was not Christs design in appointing Bishops, but his design was that they should administer *his* Sacraments and teach *his* Doctrine. This all Bishops are impowered and obliged to do; and therefore till he shew that there is a difference between Christs Doctrine and Sacraments, and those that Protestants Teach and Administer, their Episcopal Orders are sufficient to warrant them.

§. 7. And so I proceed to his third Sett of Questions, *Whether Cranmer and his Associates could condemn the Church of Rome, by pretence of the Mission received from her Bishops?* To which I answer, That if by condemning the Church of *Rome*, he meant anathematizing her, and cutting her off from the Body of Christ by a judicial Sentence, as if we were her Superiors; (which condemning only is by authority.) We never thus condemned the Church of *Rome*: Faults we believe to be in her that greatly need Reformation; but that Work we leave to her lawful Governours; our Church having declared in her Preface to her Liturgy, *that in these her doings she condemns no other Nation, nor prescribes any thing but to her own People only*; Cranmer therefore and his Associates did not condemn the Church of *Rome*, nor could he or his Fellows do it by pretence of a Mission received from her Bishops, for they received no Mission from her Bishops, but from the Bishops of *England*.

But then he proceeds to ask *by whose Authority did they condemn the Church from whom they received their Mission?*

To give the World an account of this matter; it is to be observed that the supream Government of our Church has always been in a National Council or Convocation of our Clergy; and that not only We but every National Church hath the same power of altering all Rites and Ceremonies, of abrogating and making



ing all Ecclesiastical Constitutions, and lastly of reforming all Abuses and Corruptions crept into the Church ; which the Supreme Civil Power hath of altering the Civil Constitutions ; the Fundamental Laws of Religion being preserved inviolable in the one, and of the State in the other.

The Supreme Ecclesiastical Power being lodged here, the next thing requisite is a certain Rule and Method, according to which, Laws were to be past by it ; and in the proceedings about the Reformation all alterations being made by this Power, and in this Method, it follows that they were all made legally ; and that our Churches retrenching such Ceremonies out of the Service of God as were judged Useless, Burdensome, or Superstitious ; and such Opinions as were no part of the Christian Faith, or corrupted it, was no more to make a new Faith or Church, then to to reform Abuses in the State by Act of Parliament is to make a new Kingdom. Nor do they that thus make a Reformation any more condemn their Predecessors, because they reform what was amiss in their time ; then Parliament Men condemn their Ancestors when they make a new Law.

I do confess *an honest Man cannot preach against the Liturgy, Sacraments, or Constitution of a Church by vertue of any Commission from it ; and that no Church ought to be presumed to Authorize her Priests or Bishops to go and preach the Gospel after their private Sense or Conscience, in contradiction to her declared Doctrine and Worship ; and that the Church of England gives no such power at this day.* But I deny this to be the case of the first Reformers, who did not act as private men in the Church when they Reformed ; but as representing her in her Convocation, and by her Authority. Although therefore the Church of England oblige private Men not to contradict her allowed Orders ; yet she doth not bind her self from making such Alteration in a Canonical way, as she sees convenient, or is convinced to be necessary.

If therefore Mr. M. can shew, that *Cramer* and his Associates made the Alterations without consulting her, he went indeed beyond his Commission from her ; but if she assented to all he did,

and

and to this day approves the Reformation, how did *Cranmer* condemn that Church from whence he had his Mission?

If the Alteration was good, and those things that were removed were really Errors and Corruptions, did *Cranmer* and his Associates any more than what they were obliged to do

by the very *Roman Pontifical* in their Ordination? *It belongs* (saith the Pontifical) *to a Bishop to judge, to interpret, to consecrate, ordain, offer, baptize and confirm.*

Did they do any more? This Answer he owns, and ascribes to *Burnet*, pag. 3. *The Pastors*

*and Bishops of the Church are ordained to instruct the people in the Faith of Jesus Christ, according to the Scriptures: and the Nature of their Office is a sacred Trust that obliges them to this, and therefore if they find Errors and Corruptions in the Church, they are obliged to remove them, and undeceive the people.* Mr. M. would do well to answer, on this Supposition, Whether they are, or are not obliged? If they are, then they have Mission enough to remove, in a legal way, all Corruptions, even those of their Ordainers. If they are not,

how do they answer the Engagement made in their Orders, to teach the people according to the Scriptures? But Mr. M. waves any Answer to this, and in effect owns it, only he denies or seems to deny the Supposition; where he tells us, *Cranmer and one or two Bishops pretended Errors and Corruptions, and drove on the Reformation against the major Vote of the English Bishops; p. 3.*

that is, he had Power & Mission enough, but abused it: and so to know whether *Cranmer* exceeded his Commission or no, we must know whether the Corruptions he reformed were real or pretended. For if they were real, there is no doubt but he was obliged to reform them; none else being under a deeper Obligation than he. So then Mr. M's Question is out of doors, *Who sent him?* and another substituted in the room thereof by himself; and that is, Whether there were Corruptions in the Discipline, Worship and Faith of the Church at that time? or whether

Episcopum oportet iudicare, interpretari, consecrare, ordinare, offerre, baptizare & confirmare. Pontif. de Consecrat. elect. in Episc.

It is in *Burnet's Pref.*  
Vol. 2.



ther He, and the whole Mass of Abillities were manifestly intoxicated with mists of Holy Scripture, with a Spirit of Perverseness and desire of Change &c. (pag. 4.) And we are content to joyn issue with him on these heads when he pleases.

But perhaps though *Cranmer* was obliged to reform what was amiss; yet he ought to have done it in a regular way: Whereas if we believe *Mr. M.* he drove on a Reformation against the major vote of the English Bishops. If by this, he means establishing any thing without their consent, 'tis a most notorious fallhood; for in all he did, he had the unanimous vote and consent of the major part of the Convocation, the Universal submission of the Clergy, and approbation of the People. If they complied against their Conscience, then by this we may see how excellently the *Mass* and *Confessing* had instructed them in the Knowledge and Conscience of their Duty; when they so readily complied with all Alterations. Let him try, if he can bring a Protestant Convocation to an unanimous repeal of these things by such motives. But if the Clergy in a National Council, and the People in obedience to them, or from their own inclinations did comply in earnest: what an idle Question is it to ask, *By what Authority Cranmer condemned that Church from whom he received his Mission and Holy Order?* When he concurred in all he did, and approved, nay, made all the Alterations in her Liturgy, Sacraments, and Constitutions that were made.

The true Question therefore is, *Whether the Church of England had full power to Reform her self without the consent of the Pope?*

For it is into his Supremacy all this Banter of Mission, and indeed the whole Faith of the *Roman* Church, as distinct from the Catholick is resolved. If the Church of *England* was not subject to the Church of *Rome*, she had sufficient power to Reform her self: and the only thing for which she is accountable to God, the World, and her Subjects, is the Goodness of the Reformation. If that was a good work, *Cranmer* did well in advising, and she in decreeing it: but if the Errors removed by the Reformation were not real, but only pretended, as *Mr. M.* would perswade us, (but will never be able to prove) *Cranmer* indeed was answerable

for giving her ill Counsel: but she her self is accountable for the removal of them, for it was Her Act. 'Twas by Her *Authority and Mission*, though Mr. M. cannot tell it, Page 2. that Anno 1547. the word Sacrament, in the sence which the Church then gave of it, was restrained to Baptism and the Lords Supper; and sure the Church of England had Authority enough to explain her meaning, by what words she thought fit. Let him shew if he can, that there were more Sacraments (as she understands the word Sacrament) ever owned in the Catholick Church, than those two allowed by her.

Lastly, to shew that it was not *Cranmer's* private Opinion influenced the Church; 'tis observable first that he had several private Opinions, (two whereof Mr. M. lays to his charge in his Preface) which were absolutely condemned by the Church, and the contrary established as her Doctrine, which he himself signed.

2ly. That the Bishops and Clergy of England had unanimously entred upon the Business of the Reformation in the time of *Cranmer's* Predecessor Arch-Bishop Warham, Anno 1531. by the Submission of the Clergy to the King, and acknowledging his Supremacy: and again Anno 1533, by consenting to an Act against Appeals to Rome, wherein the Nation was declared to be an entire Body within it self with full Power to do Justice in all Causes, Spiritual as well as Temporal. And this before *Cranmer* was Arch-Bishop, so far was he from condemning or imposing on the Church from whence he had his Mission.

§. 8. The fourth set of Questions concerning Mission is on this head, whether a Presbyterian Minister having received Orders from a Protestant Bishop can by vertue of such Orders pronounce the Church of England a corrupt Church, or Preach against her Sacraments or Liturgy, notwithstanding her Censures? His design in this Question, is to shew that the first Reformers had no more Authority to Preach against the Romish Church, than such a Presbyterian has to Preach against our Church: I cannot understand how a man can forsake the Church of England, and Preach Presbyterian Do-

*Erine by vertue of his Protestant Mission; nor consequently how any Man can justifie his Protestant Doctrine by vertue of his Popish Mission.* pag. 2.

*Why may not a Presbyterian, having the same Authority of Scripture which Cranmer pretended to, Preach against the Superstition of the Common Prayer, as well as he against the Idolatry of the Mass* pag. 6. and more to the same purpose, pag. 12.

In Answer to this, I will shew first, why a Presbyter or Bishop, ought not to Preach against the Constitution of the Church whereof he is a Member in contradiction to her Censures. And secondly, that this was not the first Reformers Case.

1. A Presbyter or Bishop ought not to Preach against the Constitution of the Church of which they are Members: Because there is a Regular way in which they may endeavour a Reformation. If they find any thing amiss in her Discipline or Doctrine, they may make their Application for redress of it to those that have power to reform it; but must not presume being Subjects to usurp their Governors Power: For this is the case of private mens reforming abuses in the State in spite of the King; a remedy generally worse than the disease. However, in both Cases private men may sue for Redress, and in their proper Stations endeavour it. But if such a Bishop or Presbyter be Censured and Suspended, he is thereby discharged from the Execution of his Office, and he must no more make a Schism to regain it, then one must make a Rebellion in the State to regain a Civil Office. This we urge, and I think with reason against the Presbyterians and other Sects amongst us, that either have no Ordination or Appointment to their Offices from the Church of England and Ireland, or else abuse the Power against her, which was once given them by her, and from which they are again legally suspended.

And as we urge this against them, so likewise against M. M. and his Party, who without any Mission from these Churches, do according to their private sence take a Commission from a Foreign Bishop and Church, to Preach against the declared Doctrine of that Church, to which by the Law of Christ they are Subjects.

Them we count those *Rebels*, who when censured and condemned by their own Churches and Governors, against all the known Laws of our Church, flee from her Tribunal, and appeal to Foreigners, And what *Rebels or Hereticks will ever be convicted*, (p. 4.) if they may chuse their own Judges, as these do? We do not deny the Orders of the Church of Rome; we own that she can make Priests & Bishops; but let Mr. M. shew what the Pope could ever give them Power to exercise their Office in these Kingdoms; since it is directly against the ancient Laws and Practice observed and enacted by our Ancestors, and in force at the Reformation. If a man like not the Orders therefore of his own Church, he must be without Orders, except he would be a Schismatick and Deserter, as Mr. M. has made himself.

And this is sufficient to shew that the Case of the first Reformers was vastly different from the Case of the present Dissenters; which is the second thing I am to prove. The whole strength of Mr. M's Paper doth really depend on this Parallel, and whoever reads it, will find that the only considerable Argument he produce, is, that the first Reformers Mission could not be good, because the *Presbyterians* have as much to say for *Theirs*. And that he can find no difference between these two, only that the *first Reformers were Authorised by Act of Parliament*. I have heard it given as the Character of wit, that it finds out the likeness of things; whereas it is the work of Judgment to find out the differences; Now Mr. M. having (whatever his Judgment may be) a great wit, no wonder if he could find no other difference between those two Cases. His Wit could serve him to find the likeness between the *Presbyterians* Case and Ours, but his Judgment doth not serve him to find the Difference, Now, if he had been very inquisitive, he might have been informed in this by one of the late *London Cases*, printed for *Thomas Bassett, London 1683.* and written purposely to shew this Difference; and 'tis a wonder that Mr. M. whose study lay much in Pamphlets, mist it. If he saw it, he ought to have shown those Differences there assigned to be none, before he parallell'd the Cases. But to help his understanding

understanding, I will shew three material Differences, besides that of an Act of Parliament; and besides the truth of the Doctrine, which was really on the Reformers side, and is only pretended to by Dissenters.

1. In the condition of the Persons that pretended to Reform.

2<sup>d</sup>. In the manner of their proceeding.

And 3<sup>d</sup>. In the Principles they took for their Rule.

First, Therefore there is a great difference in the condition of the first Reformers, and the present Dissenters; these being only private persons, at the best *Presbyters* over-voted by the major part of their Brethren: Whereas the first Reformers were Bishops, and the chief Governors of the Church; who had a Canonical as well as Parliamentary Mission, and to which of right it did belong to Govern and Reform the Church, over whom they were made Overseers by the Holy Ghost. Furthermore, the present Dissenters were the Bishops Subjects, accountable to them as their Superiors, and liable to be discharged from their Office, and the Benefits of the Communion of the Church by their Censure; and so their Separation from their Bishops is a Schism; that is, an Ecclesiastical Rebellion: But the first Reformers were accountable to no Superior but Jesus Christ; they were his immediate Vicars, not the Pope's; and therefore could not be guilty of any Rebellion against him.

2. And as they were thus different in their Condition, so they were likewise in the manner of their Proceedings: for the first Reformers did strictly forbid private persons doing any thing of their own Head, as may be seen by the Proclamation for Bar Feb. 6. Ed. 6. Anno 2. and accordingly they managed the whole matter by publick Authority in a Regular way, according to the ancient Forms of passing Laws, and making Alterations in the Church. Whereas both *Presbyterians* and *Papists*; that is, all Dissenters, proceed on their own Heads in spite of their Lawfull Governors. Let a *Presbyterian* take the same way to remove the pretended *Superstition* of the *Common-Prayer-Book* that the first Re-



Reformers took to remove the *Idolatri* of the *Mass*; or let the *Papists* take the same way to Establish the *Mass*, that our first Reformers took to Abolish it, and do it, if they can: But if they will make use of another way never allowed in the Church, and yet pretend to the same Power that the Bishops of *England* had, he must be blind that doth not see the vanity of their Pretences.

Mr. M. observes well, *That the not considering this Matter, hath brought a world of Confusion on these Kingdoms, and till the People understand it, we are never like to see an end of Religious distractions;* (pag. 6.) for while men without ordinary Mission from the Governors of a Church, or without extraordinary Mission testified by Miracle, shall be received by the people upon pretence they are sent by a Foreign Church, or that the People themselves can declare them Commissionated by Christ, which are the pretences of *Papists* and *Dissenters*; what more peace can be hoped for in the Church, than in a State where such things were allowed to be practised? Why may not the *Presbyterians* resist their Lawful Governors, as well as the *Papists* deny their Power, and question their Succession, though they have none to oppose to it?

The third Difference between the *Dissenters* Case in respect of Us, and our Case in respect of *Papists*, is in the Principles on which our first Reformers proceeded. They did not pretend as he slanders them in his Preface to justify their Separation (for they never made any) by the Scriptures only as interpreted by themselves, not only without, but against the Authority of the present *Catholick Church*. For on the contrary, except he mean by the *Catholick Church*, the particular Church of *Rome*, and her Adherents, the *Catholick Church* was for the Reformers, as they conceived, and the greater part of visible Christians concurred with them in their sense of Scripture, as to the most material controversies between our Church and *Rome*. But the true Principles of the Reformation were such as these, That the *Catholick Faith* ought to be always the same in all Ages, and could not receive Additions or grow by time; that nothing should be an Article of Faith to day that was not yesterday; and therefore nothing was to

be reckoned as Catholick Faith, but what was received *semper, ubique & ab omnibus*, according to *Vincentius's* Rule; and that nothing was thus Catholick, but what might be proved by Scripture taken in that sense which hath not been contradicted by Catholick Fathers. These were the Principles of the Reformers Faith.

And in other things belonging to the Government and Polity of the Church, to Rites, Ceremonies, and Liturgies: 'Twas their principle, that every National Church was at her own choice, how she would order them; and her Subjects ow'd her Obedience. These are truly Catholick Principles founded on a Rock, the word of God interpreted by Catholick Tradition, and not on the present sentiments of any party of Men, and are a sufficient hedge against Heresie and Schism, sufficient to secure the good correspondence of neighbouring, and the peace of particular Churches. Let any one compare this *Basis* with that of the *Roman* Faith, and let him judge which is most solid; whether that which is founded on the Scriptures as interpreted by all Ages of the Church, or that which has only the *Voice* of a part of the *Visible Church*, and the greater part against it. These are the *two Bases* of the Reformation and Popery.

To this Justification no Sectary can pretend, and though *Luther* and *Calvin, &c.* had really this Warrant to reject the super-added Articles of the Church of *Rome*, yet they differed in this, at least some of them, that they did not think it necessary to wait the concurrence of their Governors, but concluded the major part of the Peoples joyning with them was sufficient, without regular Forms and Process: and whether that may be allowed in any case I leave Mr. M. and them to dispute, for we are not concerned in it, and they are of full Age to answer for themselves, and he will find they can do it.

Only he is not to be pardoned when he brings in *Socinus* answering amongst other Reformers, that he Preached no new Doctrine, nor administered any new Sacrament; but only the Primitive Doctrine, &c. according to the sense of the ancient Fathers, pag. 5. which

which plainly shews that he knew nothing of *Socinus* his Opinions or Principles, who \* positively denied the necessity of Baptism; and I protested against being judged by that *Sence* the Fathers or the Primitive Church have given of Scriptures.

These are sufficient to shew the vast difference between the pretences of the present Dissenters, and the ground of our Reformation. And that the Argument he draws from the Obligation in Ordination laid on the Presbyters of our Church, *to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments as this Church and Realm have received the same according to the Commandments of God*, pag. 4. is of no force against the first Reformers; though it obliged Mr. M. not to desert our Church; and the Nonconformists not to preach in contradiction to her declared Doctrine and Worship.

§. 9. And so I proceed to his fifth Query: *Whether an Act of Parliament in France, Spain, or Germany, be not as good an Authority for Popery there, as in England for Protestantcy?*

I suppose by an Act of Parliament, he means the Laws enacted regularly by the Supreme Powers of those Nations (which he ignorantly expresses by an Act of Parliament) and to this I answer, That if any Religion is to be established in any Kingdom by temporal Rewards or Punishments, to encourage the Obedient, and terrifie the disobedient, the Supreme Powers of every Nation only can thus establish that Religion; & they themselves are sole Judges with what temporal Rewards and Punishments, and how far they will establish it: and they are answerable only to God for their actings herein. If therefore the Supreme Civil Government in France or Spain set up Popery, a Man must submit to it, or burn for it, if the Law be so: and such a Law, though it is unjust, is as forcible for a false Religion as a true.

But there is another way of establishing a Religion, and that is by convincing Mens Minds that the Religion is true; and that, according as men cordially embrace it, they shall be secured of the Divine Favour; and be happy in the next World. And if

this

this be the Christian Religion of which they are so convinced, one Principle of it is, that the Professors thereof ought to associate themselves into a Body, and that Christ the Author thereof has appointed Governors who are to descend in Succession; and that to these, regularly appointed, a due Obedience is to be paid, as Men value the Rewards or Punishments of the next life. Now Men, thus persuaded, cannot think an Act of the Civil Government alone, a sufficient Commission for any one to undertake the Function of a Spiritual Pastor, any more than an Act of these Spiritual Pastors is sufficient to capacitate and commissionate a Man to discharge a Civil Function: and therefore Mr. M. argues very unnecessarily against the Parliaments Power to *preach or administer Sacraments*, pag. 3. since the 27th. Article of our Church demes expressly that Power to the Civil Governors. I suppose I have sufficiently shewn that our first Reformers had a Canonical as well as Parliamentary Mission, and I suppose that this Canonical Mission is nothing the less valid, because the other goes along with it.

But then it may be objected; Have not *France* and *Spain* an Act of the Church, as well as State, for establishing their Religion? I answer, they have; and so has *Mahometism* in *Turkey* an Act of what they count the Church, for its establishment. And therefore it is not sufficient that the Power that establishes a Religion be competent; and the Methods regular by which it is settled: but likewise it is necessary that the Religion be true in it self: and therefore a man must examine whether the Christian Religion be more purely & truly taught & established in *England*, or in *Spain*, before he either reject or embrace the one or the other. For a false Religion may have all the regular settlements that a true can have and the Professors thereof being conscious of its weakness, are often more industrious to make the accidental security the stronger. And I do affirm that there is not one Argument in this Paper urged by Mr. M. against Protestants, but might with equal advantage be urged *mutatis mutandis* against convert Christians in a Mahometan Country; & this alone is sufficient to shew them all to be

unconclusive. The way therefore for every man to be satisfied in his Religion, is to examine it apart from the accidental advantages of it, and chuse that which has best reasons to recommend it: for a man ought to chuse his Church by his Religion, and not his Religion by his Church.

But he asks *in case there be no Judge to determine who have the true sence of Scripture, Roman Catholicks or Protestants, whether the Catholick sence be not as good as the Protestants?* (Pref. p. 3.) It were a sufficient Answer to this, to put another case like it to him in the person of a *Turk*: And it is this, in case there is no Judge to determine (as I know of none, saith the *Turk*) which is the Word of God, the *Bible*, or the *Alchoran*. Why should not the Affirmation of us *Musselmans* (who are ready to vouch to the death for the *Alchoran*, and are twice the number of you *Christians*.) be as good authority for Men to believe the *Alchoran* came from God, as your vouching for your *Bibles* is sufficient to persuade men to believe that they came from him.

But I do not love to shift off a Question, and therefore tell him that the sence put by *Roman Catholicks* on the Scripture, is not so good as the sence put on them by the *Protestants*. If it were, they would not be afraid to put it to the World, and let every person that is equally concerned judge for himself: but they had rather appeal to themselves as Judges, and then they are sure of the cause.

But then he tells us, *that he could never understand what Unity of Spirit, or agreement in Faith Christians are like to have* (page 3.) upon these Principles.

To which I Answer, more than they have now. If National Churches were left to be govern'd by themselves, & the Subjects of each Church bound to adhere to their immediate Governors in all quarrels with neighbouring Churches, those contentions must soon come to an end, as the quarrel between *St. Cyprian* & *Stephen* did. For when the Governours of differing Churches find that they cannot hurt one another, or advantage themselves by denial of Communion (as it must be when the one Church doth not raise a Faction to side with it in the other) the quarrel must



soon cease; for the thing that makes quarrels endless is interest. But if it once be counted Lawful for one Church to get a Party in the others Precincts, and set up Altar against Altar in the same place, this will continue the Schism, and is the very fundamental reason of the breaches of Charity amongst Christians that now pester Christendom, which are much worse than Divisions in Faith. And thus I have answered all his Questions, and considered all the Replies he made to these Answers he himself was pleased to observe, which were the two first things I undertook on this Head.

§. 10. I shall in the third place consider the objections he makes against the Reformers as to their Lives and Principles. If I had a mind to shuffle as he does, I would answer with him, page 13. *As for the ill practice of some, and the ill Opinions of other Reformers, which Papists are wont to charge upon the Reformation, I pass them over as no Argument at all. In our Articles and Canons an unprejudiced Reader shall find nothing but what is judicious and pious.* But his Slanders are so malicious that they ought not to be pass'd over without Animadversion.

First therefore against *Somerset* and *Dudley*, whom he calls *grand Reformers*, he objects *Sacrilege and Plundering the Church*. But as for *Dudley*, we are not obliged to defend him: he was a false Brother; being as he professed at his death always a Papist in his heart: and no wonder such Villains should pervert the most innocent design to their own advantage; since there was a *Judas* even among the Apostles, who minded only the Bag. *Somerset* was not clear from the same vice. But it is to be considered that the Pope had taught them all this Lesson by his example and wicked management of the Goods of the Church. It was he first gave the proper Patrimony of the Church, even Tithes to Lay-men, to useless and idle Monks and Fryars; it was he that by making a Trade of Simony and Sacrilege took off men's Veneration for Holy things, and made Noble-Men believe that Estates were as well bestow'd in their hands as to enrich a Foreigner. Whoever reads our Chronicles will find this to be

the true Ground of the Dilapidation of the Goods of the Church, and that this took off the Conscience of Robbing her.

As for *Cranmer* and the Bishops, they did what they could to hinder it, but were forced to buy God's truth and the establishment thereof at the rate of some of their worldly Goods; a bargain Mr. M. would never have made, nor any one that values the Church only for her outward splendour. But the Reformers hearts were not so full of the World, and yet they never established one Article or Canon that allows Sacrilege.

§. 12. But he proceeds and objects against *Cranmer*: 1. his Opinions; 2. his Recantation; 3. his Treason; 4. his Divorcing Queen Katherine; 5. his Destroying Religious Houses, and hanging up poor Abbots; 6. Setting the People a madding after New Lights; and 7. All the Confusion and Mischiefs that have since broke out upon the Stage of Great Britain.

1. *Cranmer's* Opinions: In his Preface Mr. M. Objects to him, that he said by the Scriptures no Consecration is necessary to a Priest or Bishop; only Appointment: and then, that the power of Excommunication depended only on the Laws of the Land: but he doth not observe that *Cranmer* did only humbly propose these; and did not define them, as may be seen expressly in his Subscription; nay, upon better information, retracted them, as appears by his signing Dr. *Leighton's* Opinion to the contrary. I confess it looks like a Providence that *Cranmer* should embrace some of these Opinions: For by this it plainly appears that he did not influence the Reformation so much as to make his private Opinions pass for the Doctrine of the Church, as some have with confidence enough pretended; and Mr. M. amongst the rest, who doth dissemble (or considering his reading doth probably not know) the original of these mistakes in *Cranmer*, and some others at that time, concerning the distinction of Civil and Ecclesiastical Power, which was this; The Pope had made a confusion of the Civil and Spiritual Power, by assuming to himself the erecting Kingdoms, transferring Rights, Dispensing with Oaths, and Deposing Princes: of all which there were fresh instances at that time particularly, the

Deposing

Deposing *Henry VIII.* and Absolving his Subjects from their Allegiance by *Raul H.* This having confounded the two Powers; no wonder that men could not on a sudden clear their eyes so as easily to see the limits of *Cranner*, being well assured of the Pope's usurpation; did on the other hand at first give too much to the Princes; which yet on second thoughts, finding himself still gelas in it, he recalled, and joyned with the rest in subscribing the publick Doctrine directly contrary to his former private Opinion. *Brownell's first Volume, Addenda pag. 327.*

Whereas the Pope the Head of Mr. M's Church was in as great an Error as *Cranner*, and for which there was less ground, and yet neither He nor His Successors have retracted it to this day. Let the World judge of the Discretion of this Man who forsakes a Church, because one of the Reformers had an odd Opinion, which he Retracted, and established the contrary in the Church; and yet joyns with a Church, whose Head at the same time professes and imposed as great an Error, and which stands yet unrecanted.

The second Objection against *Cranner*, is his *Recantation for fear of Death*; but let the World consider whether he or they that put him to that fear for his Religion were most guilty: and let Mr. M. say, whether he be so sure of his constancy in his new Religion, that he would be contented to be counted a Villain, if fear of Death should make him dissent in; and then why should not he allow something to humane frailty?

But he Objects in the third place, that *Cranner* subscribed a Letter for the Exclusion of his Lawful Princess: But whoever reads the History will find that he was brought with greater difficulty then any to subscribe to her Exclusion, and not till after the King, the whole Privy-Council and Judges had signed it; this then was a point of Law in which he was not singular. Mr. M. takes the liberty to question Queen *Elizabeth's* Title, and sure it was no greater fault in *Cranner* to question Queen *Mary's* after the Opinion of the Judges given against her. There is great difference between Rebellion against a King of undoubted Title, and

and being engaged on a side where the Title is really doubtful. The first is a great wickedness, and the last a great infelicity.

§. 16. His fourth Objection is the *Divorcing Queen Katherine*, but it was not only *Cranmer's* Opinion, but the Opinion of most learned Men in *Europe*, that her Marriage to the King was null. How *Vertuous* or *Innocent* soever Mr. M. reckons her, *Cranmer* was in the right when he and all the Bishops of *England* so judged it. The scruple was first raised in the King by the Ambassadors of *Spain*, and further confirmed by those of *France* before any intrigue with *Anne Boleyn*.

§. 16. His fifth Objection is *dissolving Religious Houses and Hanging up the Abbots*.

As to his dissolving Religious Houses, if his Council had been taken, it had turned to the advantage of Religion and the Kingdom, and I do not find that either have lost by it as it is. As for his Hanging up the Abbots, this is one of *Sander's* lyes transcribed by *Heylin*, in his History, who tells us

ad An. pag. 9. of the Executing of some Abbots and other Religious  
1537. Persons for their stiffness, (if I may not call it perverseness.) in opposing the Kings desires: but this is confuted by  
Burnet. Who shews that the Abbots were at-

ad An. 1532. tainted neither for stiffness nor perverseness, but  
v. 1. pag. 236. downright actual Rebellion, that is taking Arms against their Sovereign, or sending Money to those that did so.

§. 17. Sixthly, His setting People a madding after new Lights, that is, he allowed People the use of their Eyes and Ears, and did not think Ignorance the Mother of Devotion, or that Peoples Devotion or Religion was more acceptable to God, because they did not understand it; of any other setting People a madding after New Lights, *Cranmer* never was Guilty: And thus Christianity set the World near 1700 years ago a madding, and was accused by the Heathen for it.

§. 18. But he objects, lastly, That *Cromwel* and *Cranmer* were the Ring-leaders of all that Confusion and Mischief, which has since broke out on the Stage of Britain.

This

This is to charge them home, & would do their work in earnest, if true; but the best of it is, that it wants proof & Truth: for the Times since the Reformation have been as signal for Piety and Justice, as any like tract of time before, and blessed with the longest and most flourishing Peace, that, perhaps ever was seen in *England* for the space of, at least, 80 years, in which it was carried to the highest pitch of Glory that ever it reached.

And besides all this, many Confusions and Mischiefs that happened since in these Kingdoms proceeded clearly from other hands. Pray, were *Cranm* and *Cromwel* the Ring-leaders of *Tyrone's Wars*? and of the Massacre of the Protestants in 1641? which were the greatest Confusions in *Ireland* since the Reformation. Were they the Ring-leaders of four Rebellions in *Henry* the Eighth's time? of the Four in *Edward* the Sixth's, or the Rebellion and Plots in *Queen Elizabeth*? These were nevertheless some of the Confusions since on the Stage of *Britain*.

But a great many Sects have risen since, of which the Reformation was the occasion, if we believe Mr. M. I answer, Christianity was the cause of as many, and the Grace of God it self was abused. But it is to be observed, that the first Sect that opened the Gap, and introduced all the rest was P O P E R Y, planted among us by the Emissaries of *Rome*. These broke the Hedge, and shewed the way of Separation; others only imitated them, and transcribed their Practices and Principles, thinking they might as well teach men by their own Authority, as by a Foreign Commission; and it is like, that such as favour them now, set them on at first, purposely to make them a Clog and Objection to the Reformation.

Two means we do own Papists have to prevent Sects, that we want, Ignorance and the Inquisition: in a profound Ignorance, as in a dark night all things are silent; but there will be a bustle and stir among men, while the Sun shines. And for the Inquisition, it is the true *Ram* to beat down Heresie; and defend the *Apostolick See*; if we believe *Paul* the Fourth.

But



But we beg his Holiness's Pardon; we had rather suffer all our Sects, if they were more, than admit these Remedies; which after all are not effectual, as we may see from the new Sects in *Italy*, and we cannot think those the only fit means to prevent Divisions in Christianity, which may as well be applied to keep it out, and preserve Union amongst Infidels.

### C H A P. III.

§. 1. **A**ND now I come to the second Point, wherein Mr. M. was dissatisfied, which he tells us, was *the Want of Confession to a Priest*.

There is so little looks like Reason on this Head, that it is harder to find out what he intends for Argument in it; than to answer it. I will do him Justice, and consider even that little he has said. And that in this method.

1. I will lay down the Doctrine of our Church concerning Confession. How far she declares it necessary, and how far expedient only; from whence it will appear, that Confession is not wanting in her.

2. I will consider what he has produced in favour of its necessity, or expediency.

The first of these seems necessary to be handled; because he tells us, that he *drvers times discoursed with Protestant Ministers, and some Protestant Bishops, about this matter; and was sorry to find no Harmony in their Opinions*, p. 8. Now let us suppose it were true, that private men differ'd in their Opinions about some matters relating to Confession: yet it were nothing to the purpose: at least, it could be no reasonable motive to go from us to the Church of *Rome*, since her private Doctors differ as much about it. Some of which say, that the Priest ought to take the Penitents word, and grant him Absolution; although he do not believe his Profession of Repentance to be sincere. Others hold, that the Confessor ought to be satisfied of the Penitents sincerity before

before he absolve him. Some say *Attrition* with Absolution is sufficient to obtain Remission of Sins; others say *Contrition* is necessary; which is as material a difference as almost can be. Many such differences there are amongst them, and the one party accuses the other of Heresie for their differing Opinions; and yet it seems this want of Harmony amongst the *Roman* Doctors and Bishops did not hinder Mr. M. from embracing their Religion. It was therefore very partially done to leave Our Church for a pretended difference amongst our Doctors: For let us take the Difference as he represents it, and it is really no more. *Some said 'twas a thing allowed by the Church of England as very expedient in some Cases, but no matter of necessity; others thought it but a Picklock of Secrets, and a matter of ill consequence.* Methinks there is a very good Harmony between these, and that the same Men might have said both: at least the Opinions are easily reconciled, since both agree that in all cases *it is no matter of necessity*; and neither deny, *that in some cases it is very expedient*: Notwithstanding which it may be in other cases, *but a Pick-lock of Secrets, and matter of ill consequence.* Where is the disagreement or contradiction between these two? To give Mr. M. back one of his own Arguments, *for my part I do not understand it.*

§ 2. I have read a great many Protestant Books, and consulted both Divines and Bishops; and do profess that I have found them very well agreed in these things.

First, That every Sinner ought to be heartily sensible of every Sin he has committed, and acknowledge it before God with shame and sorrow; and that he can expect no Pardon from God till he actually abhor and forsake the Sin. Wherever Confession is mentioned in Scripture, it is to be understood of this kind of Confession; except the Circumstances manifestly determine the sense otherwise. This Confession alone was sufficient to obtain Remission of Sins under the Old Law, *Psal. 32. 5.* without Auricular Confession to a Priest.

2. It is necessary to Confess and Acknowledge such Sins as injure our Neighbours, not only to God, but likewise to the injured

person ; where that Confession may be an Advantage or Satisfaction to him. Restitution must also go along with Confession if it be possible: If the injured person, or they who have a title to what was his, are not to be found ; the Restitution is to be made to God for some Charitable use, according to the advice of the Priest. This case is thus determined by God himself, *Lev. 6. Numb. 5.* and by Our Church in her Exhortation to the Communion.

3. Where a Sin is notorious or publick, in as much as the Church is injured by it, and the Fact falls under her Cognizance and Jurisdiction, she may call the Sinner to an account, oblige him to make publick Confession of his Guilt, and to submit to such Discipline as she judges most probable to reform him. Her Sentence of Absolution is necessary to a person thus called to an account by her, where it may be had ; neither can he be absolved from his Sin without submitting to her Orders. This appears to be the sence of our Church, from the Rubrick to the Communion and 33. Article.

4. Where there is any doubt or scruple in a Man's mind concerning the nature of an Action, whether it be good or evil ; concerning his own Repentance, whether it be sincere and sufficient : or concerning the means and way to attain to this true Repentance : In these and the like cases the Sinner is obliged to repair to his Spiritual Guide for his Resolution, Counsel and Direction. This is commanded by Our Church in the Exhortation that gives warning for the Communion.

5. Where the sence of Guilt lyes heavy on the Conscience of a Sinner, so that there is danger of his being swallowed up by too much Grief ; he who finds his Spirit thus wounded is required to have recourse to his Spiritual Physician ; that *by the Ministry of Gods word, he may receive the benefit of Absolution.* As Our Church has expressd it in her Exhortation, whose words Mr. M. has corrupted (that he might find an occasion to cavil,) first by alledging this *Proviso* as hers in the matter of Confession ; *if a Man be troubled with any doubts or scruples ; whereas she uses no such words,*

words; either in her Office for Communion, or Visitation of the Sick: which are the two places he alledges for them. And Secondly, by leaving out these words, *but if any one requires farther comfort or counsel*, in this following Sentence; *If there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own Conscience herein*, but requires farther comfort or counsel: *let him come to me, or some other discreet and learned Minister, and open his grief*. Where the words he has left out make her sense plain, that she requires men to come to a Priest, not only in cases of Scruples and Doubts, but likewise of Grief for the sense of Guilt: and that she proposes Advice and Counsel as a remedy for the one, and Absolution as a remedy for the other. Which clearly destroys Mr. M's surmise; as if Confession in our Church were for nothing else but to be resolved in our Scruples and Doubts.

6. Confession to a Priest, even of secret Sins, is counted with us an act of Mortification, and of great uses in most cases: as it is of great use and safety to consult a Physician at any time when one finds himself sick: this is prescribed by the 19th Canon of the Church of Ireland. It is counted a great Wickedness for the Priest to reveal any such Confession. And it is forbidden under the pain of irregularity, by the 64. Canon.

7. It is not necessary by any Divine Command, that a man should discover every Sin to a Priest, though he may be had, any more than it is necessary every time a man is sick to send for a Physician. And therefore Auricular Confession is not the only way for obtaining Pardon of Sins committed after Baptism.

From these things, in which our Bishops and Divines are all agreed, though Mr. M. slanders them for want of harmony, it appears, that neither publick nor private Confession is wanting in our Church, and it can no more be said that Confession to a Priest is wanting in her, because she doth not oblige all People to it under penalty of Damnation, then a City can be said to want Water, where the Fountains are full and open, only because Men are not obliged under pain of Death to use them.

If therefore Mr. M. means any thing when he professes himself

*dissatisfied with the want of Confession to a Priest; he must mean, the want of a Law to oblige all men who hope for pardon of any sin, to confess it in particular to the Priest, and receive his Absolution for it. We must own that we have no such Law in our Church. But the reason of that want is, because neither Christ nor his Apostles left us any such.*

§ 3. It was incumbent on him, before he left our Church on that account, to produce this Law, and shew Confession to be otherwise necessary than is taught and practised by her. Let us us therefore examine what he has said on this head.

And here the only thing produced by him for the necessity of Confession to a Priest, which looks like an Argument, is contained in these words. *p. 7. If we confess our Sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our Sins, saith St. John. Faithful and Just, to what? even to his own promise which he hath thrice repeated in the Gospel; whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; but other promise that he will do it without the Ministry of his Priests, we read not in the New Testament.*

In answer to this Argument, I will shew, 1. That the words *If we confess our Sins*, do not concern Confession to a Priest. 2. When God is said to be *Faithful and Just*, it doth not particularly respect that promise, *John 20. 23. Whosoever sin's ye remit, they are remitted unto them.* 3. If it did respect this Promise, and the *Ministry of a Priest* were granted to be absolutely necessary to the pardon of Sins; yet it would not follow that Auricular Confession were necessary.

§ 4. First, the words of *St. John 1 Ep. 1. 9. If we confess our sins*, do not concern Confession to a Priest: but were designed by the Apostle to oblige every man to acknowledge and confess that he is a sinner, and that he needs Repentance and the Blood of Christ for his salvation; which will appear from the occasion and circumstances of this place. I think it is agreed that *St. John* wrote these words in opposition to the Disciples of *Simon Magus*, who taught, as *St. Irenæus* informs us, that such *as were perfect among them*,  
and



and had that Principle they called *Salt and Light* could not sin: Not but that they were guilty of the greatest villanies: but they reckoned nothing in themselves sin, because they walked in *Light* and *Truth*, while the rest of the world were in *Darkness*, as they pretended. In opposition to these, *St. John* shews us, v. 8. that if we pretend thus to be without sin, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us, but if we own and acknowledge our sins, and heartily endeavour to avoid them; then the Blood of Christ cleanses us from all sin, according to Gods promise, who gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believes in him might not perish. It is plain, from vers. 10. that such as refused to confess their sins, according to *St. John*, made God a lyar. Now this is literally true of those who deny that they are sinners, as those Hereticks did: but to deny the necessity of a particular enumeration of sins to a Priest, doth no ways impeach Gods truth: and therefore the Confession required by these words, *if we confess our sins* is not Auricular.

This is farther manifest from the ancient Fathers of the Church, not one of which understand these words of Confession to a Priest.

*St. Augustine* has written a Comment on this Epistle, and he thus explains this place. *If thou confests that thou art a sinner, the truth is in thee. — Tell men what thou art; tell God what thou art. If thou tell not God what thou art, God will damn what he finds in thee. If thou wouldst not that he should damn, condemn thou.*

Ergo si te confessus fueris peccatorem, est in te veritas. — dic hominibus quid es, dic Deo quid es. Quia si non dixeris Deo damnet Deus, quod in te inveniat. *Aug. Tract. 1. in 1. Ep. 1. Job.*

*Occumenius* refers this whole passage to the Jews. *If we who said his Blood be on us, and on our Children, should impudently say that we have not sinned, we deceive our selves — but if we acknowledge and confess this sin, he will forgive us.* Which sufficiently shews, that by confessing our sins here, is meant the acknowledging our selves to be sinners, in opposition to those who plead innocency: And that this

has

has no relation to a particular Confession of Sins to a Priest.

Sect. 5. But 2. When God is said to be *Faithful and Just*, it doth not particularly respect that Promise, John 20. 23. *Whose Sins you remit they are remitted*; which is sufficiently proved from this Argument that no ancient interpreter has thus applyed

St. Cyprian de orat.  
dom. p. 149. Oxon.

them; but on the contrary have referred them to other Promises. Thus St. Cyprian refers them to that Petition in the Lords Prayer, *Forgive us our Trespases*, and interprets Confessing in St. John by this Petition in the Prayer; to which he saith, *Forgiveness is promised*; St. John therefore saith, *that God who keeps his Promise is faithful to forgive Sins, because he who hath taught us to pray for our sins, hath promised, that his Fatherly Mercy and Pardon shall follow.*

The Roman Gloss saith, *God is faithful, who promised Grace to the humble.*

Qecum. in Loc.

Oecumenius refers this to *Isaiah 43. 26.* Where according to the Septuagint Translation, the words are, *tell thy sins first, that thou mayest be justified.* Which is ushered in with that promise, v. 25. *I, even I am he, that blottereth out thy Transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins.*

Lyra saith, *God is faithful to forgive us our Sins, because he promised so, Mat. 3. 2. Repent ye for the Kingdom of God is at hand.*

You see that the ancient Interpreters could find other Promises both in the Old and New Testament, which obliged God to forgive Sins before Auricular Confession is pretended to be instituted; and not one of them dreamed that St. John had relation to that promise; beside which Mr. M. affirms there is not another in the New Testament. How will he reconcile this to his profession of Faith, in which he promises never to interpret Scripture, but according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers? When there is not one Father to vouch his sence of this place, and several against him.

§ 6. But 3. Suppose, that consequence followed from this place which

which he infers that *God will not remit Sins under the new Testament, without the Ministry of his Priests*: Yet it would not follow that Auricular Confession is necessary; because under the old Law the Sins of the People were not pardoned without the Ministry of Gods Priests, and yet it is confessed that Auricular Confession was not then instituted. Besides if the Ministry of the Priest be necessary, why should that be understood rather of their private than publick Ministry? And lastly, their Ministry may be necessary on other accounts than hearing Confessions and pronouncing Absolutions. Thus *Oecumenius* makes the Forgiveness of Sins here promised to be that Remission Oecum in Loc. which is obtained in Baptism. *Therefore* (saith he) *God doth certainly remit Sins to them that come to his holy Baptism.*

*St. Chrysostome*, who wrote his Books *De Sacerdotio*, St. Chry. lib. 3.  
De Sacerdotio. purposely to magnifie the Priests Office, interprets the promise in *St. John 20. 23.* by the power of admitting to Baptism, and the Lords Supper: together with the Priests Intercession and Prayers for Sinners; but he says not one word of their remitting by an Absolution or Judicial Sentence. Who so ever knows *St. Chrysostom*, must own that if he had known or believed such a magnificent power in the Priests, he wou'd never have omitted it, in Books written designedly to magnifie their Office. I conclude therefore that although the Ministry of the Priests under the Gospel is necessary to the pardon of the Peoples Sins: Yet that Ministry may consist in the use of their Directions, Prayers, Intercession, and Sacraments; and I believe *Mr. M.* will hardly be able to shew any other way of Absolution used by the ancient Church. Nay, *St. Cyprian* denies that Priests properly forgive Sins; because all that they can do is to put men in a way to be forgiven. Non quasi a nobis Remissionem peccatorum consequantur, sed ut per nos ad intelligentiam dilectorum suorum convertantur, & domino plenius satisfacere cogantur, Cyprian. Ep. 75. p. 219. Oxon.

*Sett. 7.* The second thing *Mr. M.* intends for an Argument in favour of Confession, is what he alledges, *p. 7.* that Confession is approved and frequented by all the Christian World, except the Peo-  
p/e

ple of our Islands, and some few others that call themselves reformed; and further p. 8. that it was never heard of in the Catholick Church that Christians may receive the communion of Christs Body and Blood without a previous confession and Absolution. Which if true, proves this Doctrine to be Catholick both as to time and place; but the best of it is, that we are not bound to take his word. And that upon Examination this will be found false in both the parts of it. For neither do all other Christians beside the Reformed frequent and approve Auricular Confession otherwise than our Church doth: Nor is it any new thing in the Catholick Church for Men to come to the Communion without private Confession and Absolution by a Priest.

The whole Greek Church denies Auricular Confession to be of divine Right, pretending it only to be a positive and Ecclesiastical constitution: And they give the Communion to Laicks both in health and sickness, though they have not before confessed their Sins to a Priest; and that because they are perswaded that Confession is Arbitrary, and that Faith is the only and true preparative for receiving the Eucharist. So Father Simon shews from *Caucus Venetus* in his Religion and Customs of the Eastern Nations, p. 8. Lond. Ed. 1685. and he owns that *Caucus* has asserted nothing as to that point which doth not agree to the real belief of the Greeks, p. 13.

Of the Christians of St. Thomas in India, he relates from *Meneses*, that they abominate Auricular Confession, p. 94. And though he pretends this to be an abuse introduced into that Church, p. 102. yet he produces nothing but his own conjecture to prove it so, and acknowledges, that most in the East think not themselves obliged to it by Divine Right; and consequently it may either be used or laid aside as the Church thinks convenient. We learn the same

Decret. de poenit.  
D. ft. 5. Can. 1.

from the Gloss of their own Canon Law; where we are told, that Confession to a Priest is better said to be instituted by a certain Tradition of the universal Church, then from the Authority of the Old or new Testament. This Tradition of the Church obliges as a Command, and therefore with us (he means the Church of Rome) Confession of mortal

*tal Sins is necessary. But is not necessary with the Greeks, because they have no such Tradition.* Here is a Tradition pretended of the Universal Church, and yet an acknowledgment, that at least one half of that Church has no such Tradition: which is as good sense as *Roman Catholick*. However I take this to be a Demonstration, that Confession is no other ways approved and frequented by the Christian World; (except the Church of *Rome*) than it is by the Reformed. That is, it is looked on by all, but Mr. M's Church, as a piece of Ecclesiastical Discipline only, and then it may be used or dispensed with, as the Church sees most for her Edification.

§ 8. This is not only the Opinion of the greater part of the present Visible, but it was so likewise of the Ancient Church: Though Mr. M. tells us with confidence enough, that *it was never heard in the Catholick Church till Henry VIII. that any was admitted to the Communion without Confession.*

Yet we find direct proof to the contrary in Antiquity:

(a) *Socrates* tells us, that *Nectarius Bishop of Constantinople, took away the Priest that was appointed for Confessions since the time of the Decian Persecution, and gave free leave, that every one should come to the participation of the Holy Sacrament, as his own Conscience directed him.* (b) And *Sozomen* adds, that the Bishops of almost all other Churches, imitated him.

(c) *Gratian* proposes the Authorities for and against the necessity of Confession, and leaves it to the Readers Judgment which he will believe. (d) And the Gloss

(a) *Eudæmon* — Episcopo Nectario dedit consilium, ut Presbyterum poenitentiarum tolleret, & liberam daret potestatem, uti pro sua quisque Conscientia ad mysteria participanda accederet, *Soc. l. 15. cap. 19.* Ab illo tempore, quo Novatiani se ab Ecclesia sejunxerant, recusaverantque cum his, qui tempore persecutionis regnante Decio concitatz lapsi erant, communicare, Ecclesiarum Episcopi Canonici adjunxerunt, ut in singulis Ecclesiis Presbyter quidam poenitentiae praeisset, *Soc. ib.* (b) Hoc tempore Presbyterum, qui poenitentibus deputatus esset, esse non amplius passus est, omnium primus Nectarius: quem omnes fere Ecclesiarum Praefules imitati sunt, *Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 16.*

(c) De poenit. Dist. 1. Can. 89. Cui autem horum potius inhærendum sit, lectoris judicio reservatur.

(d) Igitur 1150. tempore Gratiani nondum super hoc quicquam definitum aut præceptum erat ab Ecclesia, quia Gratianus non ignorasset nec omisisset, sed fere post alios 100 Annos introducta fuit oris

Confessor per *Innocent III.* Glossa Margin ubi supra.



on that is very remarkable. *In the year 1150. in the time of Gratian, nothing was defined or commanded concerning the necessity of Confession by the Church: For if there had, Gratian had not been ignorant of it nor omitted it, but Confession with the Mouth was introduced near an hundred years after by Innocent III.* Thus the Roman Gloss, and the Reader must judge, whether he will believe Mr. M. who affirms, that Auricular Confession was always necessary, or the Canon Law and Gloss, that says, it was made necessary about the year 1215: That is not full three hundred years before Henry VIII. so late is this Sacrament even in the Roman Church, and the Doctrine of its necessity.

§ 9. The third Argument Mr. M. produces for Confession, is grounded on the inconveniencies that arise from the want thereof: He tells us, *that Protestant Sermons have some Authority upon the People, but not much for lack of this curb on their Vices, p. 6.* Now whether Sermons or Auricular Confession are the greatest curb to Vice, can only be judged by Experience; and let that determine whether Protestants or Papists are most Licentious: Let us compare Protestant Countries with Popish, and see where Vice doth most abound. Let us look into Germany, Denmark, Switzerland, the Low Countries, England and Scotland, and compare them with Italy, France, and Spain; and let any one judge which are most corrupt in their Morals, or most happy in their Government. Among our selves, Let us compare the Protestants who have lived in prosperity these last thirty years, and consequently have been most lyable to corruption, with the Papists that have been in adversity, and consequently are at the best: and from these, we shall discern what a mighty curb Confession is on the Vices of Men. Lastly, Compare the times before the Reformation, with what has been since, and we shall find even Rome it self at this day reformed to what it was: which shews that the Light of Truth, which we propose to our People is not so weak a curb on Men's Vices, as Mr. M. would persuade us.

This second inconveniency he alledges from the wont of Confession

feſſion is the encouragement it muſt needs give People to ſin, when they conſider they are not obliged to give an account for their Sins. So (p. 6.) *Catholiques commit ſin, 'tis true; but call themſelves to an account for it by Confefſion and Submiſſion to their ghhoſtly Fathers. Proteſtants ſin likewise without calling themſelves to any ſuch reckoning; becauſe they can make a ſhift without it.* And again (p. 7.) *I pray the Reader to conſider whether private Sinners in the Church of England do not offend God at a cheaper rate than in the Church of Rome; ſince in the Church of Rome they are bound to ſome Penance; but in the Church of England they may confeſs to their Miniſters, and do Penance if they will, or if they will not, they may let it alone.*

To which I anſwer, That the Church of England hath no Tax of Sins, nor doth She promiſe Pardon of Sins upon the performance of any external action whatſoever, whether it coſt the performer dear or cheap. But ſhe tells her People, according to the Scriptures, that there is no other way to be forgiven our ſins, but be heartily turning from them; that a good Life, and ſincere Obedience to the Commandments of God through Faith in Chriſt are the only means to eſcape Damnation. And that according as every one is certain of the ſincerity of his own heart, he may be certain of Heaven, and no otherwiſe.

Let us then compare the Doctrine of the two Churches together, and let the Reader judge, who teaches the eaſieſt method for Pardon of Sins. Saith the

*Church of Rome; If any be ſo affected in his mind, that he is ſorry for the ſins he hath committed; and deſign not to ſin for the future, although he be not touched with ſuch a ſorrow, as may be ſufficient to obtain Pardon: Nevertheless when he confeſſes duly to a Prieſt, he doth by the Power of the Keys obtain Remiſſion and Forgiveneſs for all his Villanies.*

*Si quis ita animo affectus ſit ut peccata admiſſa doleat, ſimulq; in poſterum non peccate conſtituat: etſi ejusmodi dolore non efficiatur, qui ad impetrandam veniam ſatis eſſe poſſit: ei tamen, cum peccata Sacerdota rite confeſſus fuerit, Clavium ſcelera omnia remitti, & condonari. Catech. ad Rom. par. 2. q. 8. Pont. Sec. 47.*

Saith the Church of England; Repent you truly for your sins past, have a lively Faith in Christ our Saviour; amend your Lives, and be in perfect Charity with all Men; so shall ye be meet partakers of these holy Mysteries. The Church of Rome sees the difference of these two, and pretends, that Confession was appointed by the Mercy of God, to make Pardon

Ut enim hoc concedamus, contritione peccata deleri; — quoniam pauci admodum ad hunc gradum pervenirent, fiebat ut à paucis hac via peccatorum venia speranda esset. Ubi supra Sect. 46.

the more easie. For, *Let us grant it, saith she, that Sins could be blotted out by Contrition. — Yet in as much as few could come to this degree, it must happen that very few could expect Pardon of Sins this way.*

The true Intention of Confession, and of all other parts of Christian Discipline is Amendment of the Peoples Lives. And it will be found that Men do not come to Confession so much to help them to live well for the future, as to ease themselves from the Trouble that the memory of their Sins past create them, and when by Absolution they are eased of the sense of their former Guilt, they are apt to think they may begin on a new score. And hence it often happens, that Men are more negligent after Confession than before. And let

De la Freq.  
Communion,  
part. 2. ch. 40.  
item part. 3.  
chap. 16.

never so much care be taken to prevent this abuse which Mr. *Arnauld* confesses almost Universal: while People believe that the Priest can forgive them their sins, as soon as they are sorry for them, and purpose to forsake them, it is impossible it should be removed. Whereas when a Man is referred to his own Conscience, as the final judge of his own Condition; and told that he damns himself if he be partial. And that no other Sorrow or Repentance for Sin can save him, but such as will in earnest prevail with him to forsake his Sins, and live a good Life. In this case a Man will find it much easier to satisfy the Priest, and obtain Absolution from him; than to satisfy his own Conscience. Nay, after all, the Priest can only judge of a Mans Repentance from his own Mouth, and if the Man be partial, or mistaken in his own sincerity, the Priest must be so too, and his Absolution

insigni-

insignificant. And therefore our Church, who lays the efficacy of Absolution on the sincerity of the Penitents Contrition and Faith, and tells her People, that her Absolution is only Conditional, deals more severely, and sincerely too, with her Penitents, than the *Roman Church*, who lays the chief stress on the outward Absolution of the Priest. The Matter of Fact appears to be really thus, from the practice of the lewdest Livers amongst us, who often take Sanctuary in that Church, and without any amendment of Life, live in hopes of that Salvation in her, which they know they could not hope for in ours.

§ 11. The last Argument Mr. *M.* urges for Confession, is the Interest of the Priest; saith he, *The Church of England*, for want of Confession, *appears to me to have lost that Interest in the Consciences of the People, which both the Roman and the Greek Priests are happy in at this day.* I do believe in my Conscience this Argument goes a great way with Mr. *M.* and not only with him, but with all those Priests who value their Interest as he does. But he would have done well to have told us, what that interest is, in which the Priests count themselves happy. For the Priests have counted themselves happy sometimes in an interest, which contributed very little to the happiness of the People. In short, we neither do, nor ought to covet any other interest with our People, than the power of doing and making them good; and God be thanked, we have as much of that interest, as any Clergy of the World; and dare compare the Lives of our People, with the Lives of either *Greeks or Romans*. It was therefore some other interest which brought in Auricular Confession, & in which Mr. *M.* would count himself happy. I shall not determine what that may be, which Mr. *M.* could not find in our Church; only he must know, that among us truly mortified, diligent, sober, prudent Clergy-men, who continually reside on their Cures, and shew themselves an Example to their Flocks in meekness, humility, watchfulness and charity, have no reason to complain that they want interest with their People. But there are some that think it too dear a purchase at that rate, and therefore had rather come at it another way.

way. That is, by perswading people that they can forgive them their Sins, though perhaps they are nothing bettered by Confessing. Thus Mr. *M.* seems to state the case : *What if some Catholicks, are never the better for it ? What are many Protestants the better for all the Sermons they hear, and Sacraments they receive ? If we confess our Sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our Sins. What ? though we are never the better for Confessing. If that be Mr. M's meaning, and he believes himself, he had reason in earnest to change his Church : For he may be sure we have no such Catholick Doctrine.*

#### CHAP. IV.

§. 1. **M**R. *M.* tells us, that the third difficulty that stuck with him, was the Answer given by Protestants to that Question. *Where is that one Holy Catholick Church which we do profess to believe in the two Creeds ?* To this he adds several other Questions : *Was there any such Society as one Holy Catholick Church extant upon the face of the Earth, when Cranmer began his Reformation ? What Provinces of the Earth did this Church inhabit ? Did Cranmer believe himself a Member of it ? Who gave him Authority to Reform this one Catholick and Apostolick Church ? To set up Altar against Altar ; &c. p. 8.* To each of these Questions I will give a distinct Answer, and shew how little Reason any one has to make a difficulty of them.

To the first, *Where is that one Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church which we profess to believe in the two Creeds ?* I Answer, not in any one place or Province exclusively to the rest, but in all places where Men professing the Faith of Christ, live under their Lawful Pastors or Spiritual Governors. 'Tis by these two marks we must find the Catholick Church, if we would not mistake the Society of Schismaticks and Hereticks, nay of Heathens for her. Where ever we find the Faith of Christ, and the Persons professing it,



it, living in submission to their Regular Pastors; there we have found a branch of the Catholick Church; and to that Society we ought to be ready to unite ourselves in this Profession and Submission.

But Mr. *M.* by his eagerness to have us assign the *ubi*, or place where to find this Church, seems to imagine, that there is some one place, or *ubi*, where she is always to be found. At least, that there is some where a Head and Principle of Unity, by union to which, the Society is made one. But we deny any other Head or Principle of unity to this Society, besides Christ Jesus. And we believe, that to assign any such on Earth, is to destroy the very notion of the Catholick Church, and make her as particular as the Jewish Synagogue, out of which no Person or Nation was excluded, so they would turn Profelytes, any more than they are excluded out of the Church of *Rome*, if they will embrace her Faith, and submit to her Government. But the Church is called Catholick, in opposition to such a particular Society; because she consists of many such Societies, which have in every Nation the same Privileges, which were before peculiar to the Jews. And these particular Churches are intire Bodies in themselves, not made accountable by Christ or his Apostles to any Foreign Church, as to a Head, but only as to a Sister. Neither is the union of these particular Churches into one Catholick Church, an union of subjection to one visible Head, but an union of Faith and Charity under our visible Head Christ. When therefore Mr. *M.* asks in *what Provinces of the Earth this Church doth inhabit?* I answer, in most Provinces of the World; in more by many than he or his Church will allow. Let him read St. *Augustine* on the 85 *Psalm*, and he will tell him the sin of those that confine the Church to a Province, or corner of the World, to a Sect or Party of Christians.

§ 2. To this second Question, *Was there any such Society upon the face of the Earth, when Cranmer began his Reformation?* I answer, there was, and the several branches of it were dispersed through many Provinces in *Europe, Asia and Africa*. The Church  
of

of *England* was one branch thereof, such she has continued ever since, and we hope will continue to the end of the World : And therefore he might have spared the labour which he has spent to prove that there *was extant such a Church on the face of the Earth* ; since we believe as firmly as he can desire, that according to our Saviour's Prediction, *the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Catholick Church*.

§ 3. To this third Question, *Did Cranmer believe himself a Member of this Church* ? I answer, He did. And being placed by Providence in an eminent station in the Church, and the Care and Government of so considerable a part thereof being committed to his charge, he found himself obliged by the Laws of God and Man to remove those things he apprehended to be Corruptions and Abuses. And if they were really such, who but Mr. M. can doubt his Authority do do it in a regular way ?

And therefore to his fourth Question, *Who gave him Authority to Reform this one Holy Catholick Church, and to set up Altar against Altar* ? I answer, No body ; he never attempted the one or the other. He never attempted to Reform the Catholick Church, because he had neither Power or Inspection over her. Nor did he ever pretend to make any Law to oblige her. He only endeavoured to cultivate and reform that part of her that was committed to his Care. And he must have lost his Understanding, or renounced it, that doth not see that this is the Duty of every Bishop, nay of every Parish-Priest in his sphere ; and therefore except Mr. M. can shew that *Cranmer* went beyond his sphere, he talks and asks questions to no purpose.

I suppose that I have already shewn that *Cranmer* did not exceed his Authority in his proceedings at the Reformation. And as he did not pretend to reform the Catholick Church, so neither did he set up Altar against Altar. There was no Schism made by him in *England* ; the Division of Communion was made long after, about the Tenth of *Queen Elizabeth*, on the Bull of *Pius V.* *Heylin ad Ann. 1564. & 1565. p. 172.*

§ 4. Mr. M. seems to have nothing to object against all this ; only

only he insinuates that the Reformation supposes the Catholick Church to be lapsed into Idolatry: And if she were guilty of Idolatry, she should be no Christian Church: And then there is an end of the Episcopal Succession of the Church of England, and consequently of the Church it self.

There is not one step in this Argument, but is justly liable to exception. I shall only desire the Reader to consider these few things, and then judge, whether Mr. *M.* can be supposed to have examined this matter, either diligently or impartially. 1. The Reformation may be justified without charging the Church of *Rome*, or any other Christian Church with Idolatry. 2. The Idolatry with which we commonly charge that Church, is not inconsistent with the Being of a Church, or Succession of Bishops. 3. The Argument Mr. *M.* has produced, to prove the Impossibility of a Christian Churches teaching and practising Idolatry, is weak and inconclusive.

*Sett. 5.* First, The Reformation may be justified without charging the Church of *Rome*, or any other Christian Church with Idolatry: Because there were many confessed and notorious Abuses in the Church that needed Reformation, besides what we count Idolatrous. And the Governors of the Church were obliged to reform them whether they were Idolatrous or no; except Mr. *M.* thinks that nothing but Idolatry can need Reformation. Prayer in an unknown Tongue, the half Communion, the ludicrous and antique Ceremonies of the Mass, private Masses and Indulgences, Appeals and Foreign Jurisdiction, with many other things were removed by the Reformers; not because they counted them Idolatrous, but because they were great Abuses and Deviations from the Primitive Rules and Practice of the Church. The things in the *Roman* Church, which we commonly charge with Idolatry, are the Worship of Images, the Invocation of Saints, and Adoration of the Host: Now the Reformation would neither be unjustifiable nor unnecessary, *tho* we should reckon these practises only in the same rank of abuses with the former. We need not therefore charge the Church of *Rome* with Idolatry, to justify our first Reformers.

But whatever be said as to that, he may assure himself we never did, nor will charge the *Catholick Church* with any such Crime. She never decreed either worship of Images, or adoration of the Host.

§ 6. But secondly, the Idolatry with which we charge the Church of *Rome*, is not inconsistent with the being of a Church, or Succession of Bishops. I do confess there is an Idolatry, inconsistent with all true Religion; that is, when Men renounce the true God, and worship a false one in his stead. But there is another Idolatry, that consisteth in worshipping a false God with, or in Subordination to the true. And a third, which Men incur by giving some part of that honour to a Creature, which God has reserved for himself; or asking those things of Creatures, which God only can give: And 'tis with this last the Church of *Rome* stands charged.

Now not only Doctor *Stillingfleet*, whom he \* Just. Vindic. p. 171. confesses he never read, but \* Primate *Bramhall* also, (whom he pretends to have seen) have proved that some practice of this kind of Idolatry, as well as some other Sins, may consist with the Being of a Church. But what shall we say to a Man who understands but little himself, and will not be persuaded to read those who can inform him. Who takes this opinion by *hear say*, as if it were peculiar to one Author; whereas it is the common sense of our Controvertists. Which I think is a Demonstration, that notwithstanding what he pretends (p. 1.) he is yet to *begin to study the Controversie between both Churches*. He confesses he did *not understand this matter*; and then let the World judge, whether it was done like a Man who either loved, or designed truth, to write against a thing before he understood it.

§ 7. In order to help his understanding, he would do well to consider, 1. Whether to teach and practice Idolatry, destroy the very Being of a Christian, more then of a Jewish Church. Now it is plain that the Jewish Church both taught and practised Idolatry, and is charged as Idolatrous; 1. When *Aaron* with the whole Congregation, sacrificed to the Calf: and afterwards, when the Kings of *Judah* establish'd Idolatry in the very Temple of God: In which  
Ido-

Idolatry the Priests, Prophets, Princes and People concurr'd; as we may see, *Jer. 2. 26.* and yet neither their succession nor Church fail'd

*Se. 7. 8. 2.* The Primitive Church did not look on all Idolatry as destructive of the Being and Succession of a Church: Because she allowed the Succession of those she counted Idolaters. Such she reckoned the *Arians*, as we may learn from *Athanasius* and *Gregory Nyssen*; and yet the Succession of the *Arians* was allowed in (a) *Felix*, Bishop of *Rome*. In (b) *Meletius*, Bishop of *Antioch*. And lastly, in the Bishops of *Spain*, who had been *Arians* from their first Conversion, till the time of their King *Ricaredus*, in whose Reign they turned Catholics, and proceeded in that Reformation at the same rate our Reformers proceeded in Ours. (c) If Mr. *M.* had lived among them, he would have told them that they were no Bishops, nor had any Church: Because their Predecessors for several Generations had taught and practised Idolatry. And if we believe him, surely that destroys the very Being of a Christian Church. But neither these Bishops, nor the Church of that Age were of his Mind. And therefore they went on in their Business, and settled their Church without troubling any body to assist them. And though they had no other Ordination or Sacraments, than what they had received from *Arians*, (that is from much worse Idolaters than the Papists are counted); yet no body ever questioned their Church or Succession. But Mr. *M.* and his party, love to cut short God's Church and Inheritance, and seem afraid too many should go to Heaven. And therefore when any thing in a Church doth not please them, they immediately un Church her, and send her Members to Hell: Imitating exactly in this, as they do in their Re-ordination, the Heretical Donatists. Whom (d) *St. Augustine* sharply reproves for their Uncharitableness.

(a) Soc. lib. 2. cap. 37.  
Col. Allogr. 1612.  
(b) Sozom. lib. 4.  
cap. 27.

(c) Spond. ab Anno  
595.

(d) In *Ps. 81.* *Cum* b. h. e.  
maledicunt, qui dicunt quod  
perit Ecclesia de toto orbe ter-

rarum, & remansit in sola *Africa*. Si diceres illi, perdes villam tuam, forte non à te temperaret manum; & dicis Christum perdidisse hereditatem suam redemptam sanguine suo. Ergo injuriam facis Christo, ut dicas populum ejus ad istam exiguitatem diminutum, Ideo natus es, Ideo Christianum te dicis, ut invidias glorie Christi.



*Sc. 9.* But 3. Mr. M. is the more inexcusable; because the Argument he brings, to prove the Inconsistency of Idolatry and a Christian Church, is so very trifling and inconclusive. For (saith he) *what agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols, and what concord hath Christ with Belial? For ye are the Temple of the Living God; what Communion hath Light with Darkness? 2 Cor. 6. 16. What! Idolaters, and yet a true Church? 'Tis as much as to say, they are in the way to Heaven and Hell at the same time, p. 8.* In answer to this, I must desire the Reader to look into the place of Scripture here quoted, and observe that the Sentences are broken, and mangled, and transposed; either out of Design, or, as I am apt to think, out of meer thoughtlessness. If he had given it whole, the Reader would easily have perceived its weakness; for it is not only said, *What agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols? v. 16.* but likewise, *What Fellowship hath Righteousness with Unrighteousness? and, What Communion hath Light with Darkness? v. 14.* If then, according to Mr. M. Idolatry destroy the very Being of a Church, because there is no agreement between the Temple of God and Idols: why shall not every Unrighteousness or Sin destroy likewise the Being of a Church? Since there is no fellowship between Righteousness and Unrighteousness; no communion between Light and Darkness. May not I argue as he doth, *What! Unrighteousness and a true Church? 'Tis as much as to say, they are in the way to Heaven and Hell at the same time.* This is the very Argument by which \* *Petilian* the Donatist endeavoured to unchurch all other Christians besides his own Sect, and annul all other Baptism besides his own parties: because he pretended they communicated with wicked Men; and there could be no fellowship between Righteousness and Unrighteousness, between Believers and Unbelievers. How then could an Unbeliever regenerate a Believer in Baptism? There is indeed no agreement between Idolatry and a true Church; no more is there between her and any other Sin. But things that have no agreement do not immediately destroy one another.

\* Aug. Tom. 7.  
 lib. 2. contra  
 Literas Peti-  
 liani.

another. It doth not follow therefore, that to teach & practice any Sin, destroys the very Being of a true Church. Rebellion is as the sin of Witchcraft, that is, equal to one of the worst kinds of Idolatries; shall therefore every Society of Men, that teaches & practices Rebellion, cease to be a Church? I hope Mr. *M.* will not say it. I do not say any Society of Men ever taught Treason, or Rebellion, or Idolatry to be lawful; for this would indeed un-church them: But many have commanded such practices, & taught them to be lawful, which being put in execution, were really treasonable, rebellious, or idolatrous. Thus the Council of *Lateran* commanded Temporal Lords who did not purge their Dominions of Hereticks, to be deposed by the Pope; and absolved their Subjects from their Allegiance. And thus the Council of *Lyons* deposed *Frederick* the Emperor. The one of these taught, and the other practiced Rebellion. Must we therefore un-church these Councils? \* Pope *Paul* III. and his Faction taught and commanded the Subjects of *Henry* VIII. to depose their Prince. † *Pius* V. taught and commanded the Subjects of Queen *Elizabeth* to do the like to her. These were all acts of Treason or Usurpation: and sure *these are the way to Hell* as well as Idolatry. And then to say, those that were guilty of such things, were Members of the Catholick Church, is according to Mr. *M.* to say *they were in the way to Hell and Heaven at the same time; but such Arguments must be taken from him where there are no better.*

Viđ. Concil.  
Later. 4. c. 3.

\* Viđ. Bullam apud  
Burnet. Col. p. 166.  
ex Bullar. Cherub,  
tom. 2. p. 740.

† Apud Sanderum  
de Visibili Mor.  
p. 710.

## CHAP. V.

§ 1. **T**He third part of Mr. *M.*'s Pamphlet, consists of a confused mass of particulars, without any order or connexion; one would think it had been taken from the mouth of one who had spoken it *ex tempore*, and had never been allowed the liberty to revise it. There are at least five offers at a conclusion. Saith he,

p. 9.

p. 9. to conclude, p. 10. in a word, p. 11. in fine, next paragraph on the whole matter, p. 12. after all his concluding, he must have a word or two before he make an end, p. 13. he promises to say no more, and yet he cannot forbear adding two or three things, nothing to the purpose. Thus he says and unsays, and labours in a heap of confusion. And when all is done, he puts things in a less advantageous Light, than has been done by many of his Brethren before him. I shall bring what he says, such as it is, into this method. 1<sup>st</sup>. I will consider what he says in order to vindicate, or recommend his new Church. And 2<sup>ly</sup>. Wherein he criminales ours.

§ 2. He endeavours to vindicate his new Church in her Devotions; as to the Direction of them: as to their being in an unknown Tongue; and as to their being made before Images. He endeavours to recommend her, from the excellency of her Prayers, and from the Devotion and Unity of her People.

As to the direction of her Prayers; he tells us, That *instead of Idolatry, he found most elevated and judicious Prayers to the Holy Trinity; concluding in the Name of our Saviour Jesus Christ*, p. 9. and he asks, *Do Roman Catholicks ever say Mass to any other object but the living Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?* p. 12. Now if all the Prayers in the *Mass* be so very elevated and judicious, and all said to the *Trinity* only; then God forgive the wickedness of those People who quarrel at this, and persecute it with so blind and furious Aversion. But soft and fair Mr. M. consider they are Hereticks you pray for, and ten to one either do not deserve, or do not need your Charity. For suppose the Prayers in the *Mass* were never so judicious, and never so well directed; yet for ought the People know, or any assurance they have besides the honesty of the Priest, the Prayers may be Conjuring, or Cursing; directed to *Jupiter* or *Mahomet*; and therefore 'tis your own Fault that people persecute them with so blind and furious Aversion; since you keep the people in that blindness, and will not let them understand their Prayers, that they may admire their Judiciousness.

§ 3. But 2<sup>ly</sup>. It is to be considered, that the *Mass* was patched  
up

up in a barbarous and ignorant Age, though many of the Materials are old ; and the composition is such, that all, even of the *Roman* Communion, are not satisfied concerning the Judiciousness of the Prayers in it. In so much that (a) *Cassander*, who was a little better acquainted with it than Mr. *M.* confesses the phrase is obscure, even to Learned Men : that the Canon is difficult, and that sometimes there is a sudden jump from one sense of a word to another.

*Cassander* was no perverse ill-natured Phanatick, but a learned and ingenuous *Roman Catholick* : and yet he finds fault with this Prayer Mr. *M.* has produc'd, and others of the like importance in the *Mafs* ; because they are improperly used as *Masses* are now celebrated : for these Prayers have respect (as he tells us) to an ancient custom in the Church now gone out of use ; and agree chiefly to a Solemn *Mafs*, in which there is supposed to be a Communion and Congregation of the people that have offered Bread and Wine. This Bread and Wine offered by the People, is that *immaculate Sacrifice* offered up by the Priest in the Prayer mentioned by Mr. *M.* And where neither People are present, nor any Offering is made by them, this Prayer, and several others in the *Mafs*, make a hard shift to gain the Estimation of either Sense or Truth, much less of Judiciousness. And has given occasion to some, to abuse the *Mafs* to Superstition ; and to others, to condemn it as Impious. How can a Priest, with either Judgment or Truth, offer a Sacrifice for all present, as the Prayers direct him to do ; even in a solitary *Mafs*, when none is present or near him ?

(a) Ipsa etiam loquendi forma Canonem ipsum non indoctis hominibus obscuriorem, & difficiliorem reddat. — Est autem hujus obscuritatis præcipua causa, quod in eo multipliciter Sacrificii nomen usurpetur ; & subito non nunquam ex uno intellectu in alium transitio fiat. *Consul. de iteratione*, p. 1004.

(b) Ut si orationibus his sua veritas confiteri, intelligi debent ea symbola panis, & vini, quæ in dominica mensa ad Consecrationem proposita sunt, nomine populi esse oblata. — Deinde dubium non est, quo tempore Canon hic initio usurpabatur, aliquos semper adfuisse, qui una cum ipso sacerdote, hæc Sacrificia laudis efferebant, & Sacramenta participabant, id enim Canonis verba manifestè significant. — Cujus ignoratio aliis ad superstitionem eo abutendi aliis, ut ipsum ipsum damnandi occasionem dedit. *Ubi supra*, p. 1003.

But 3<sup>ly</sup>. As all the Prayers in the Mass are not judiciously contrived, so neither are they all said to the Trinity ; the very Sacrifice being offered up for the Honour of Saints and Angels, and to obtain of them their Intercession : besides several Prayers made to them for the same purpose, directly contrary to what we learn from Saint *Augustine* to have been the Practice of the ancient Church.

Ut illis proficiat ad honorem, nobis autem ad salutem : & illi pro nobis intercedere dignentur, &c. Ordo Missæ.

Suo loco & ordine nominantur, non tamen à Sacerdote qui sacrificat invocantur. De Civit Dei, lib. 22. cap 10.

§ 4. Mr. *M.* seems aware of this Objection, and hints at three Answers to it. 1<sup>st</sup>. That Presbyterians object as much against that Canticle in the Common-Prayer-Book, called *Benedicite*. 2<sup>dly</sup>. That the Roman Catholick ascribe nothing to Angels or Saints, but as the Ministers of God And 3<sup>dly</sup>. That the Angels must know our affairs, and the Saints have intelligence from them ; and therefore we pray to them.

1. He assures us, That the Reader shall find Protestants objecting nothing against Confessing, and Praying to Saints and Angels ; but what Presbyterians do against that Canticle in the Common-Prayer-Book, called *Benedicite omnia opera*. O Ananias, Azarias and Misael, praise ye the Lord, is as rank Popery with Presbyterians, as any thing in the Mass, or Litanies of our Lady, p. 9. Now except he be able to shew where the Presbyterians have declared this as their sense, we can count him no better than a Slanderer. For my part I do profess, that I never yet met with one single Presbyterian so silly as to make this Apostrophe for an Invocation of dead Men, who do not hear us. The disparity of the case is so manifest between our Church and the Roman, that it is hardly possible any should mistake. \* The Ro-

\* Confil. Trid. Sess. 25. de Invocatione, &c.

(a) Article 22.

man Church has determined that it is good and profitable humbly to invoke the Saints, and to see to their Prayers, Help and Assistance. (a) Our Church has declared Invocation of Saints to be a fond thing, vainly invented. To parallel therefore the Presbyterian Objection

( if



(if any such there be) against us; with ours against the Papists on this Head, is to shift off an Objection, which did not easily admit of an Answer.

§ 5. Let us see if this second Answer be any better; which is, that the *Roman Catholicks* attribute nothing to *Angels or Saints*, but as the *Ministers and Favourites of the Living God*, receiving from him whatever understanding they have of our affairs, p. 12. But what then? May not Men ascribe more to Favourites than the King allows them, and is not that an encroachment on his Prerogative? If Mr. M. will shew us, where God allows us to make Prayers to Saints, to erect Images for their Worship, burn Incense before them, dedicate Churches to their Honour, make Vows to them, or devote Orders and Societies of Men as slaves to their Service, he will indeed vindicate his Church against the Reformation: for in possession of all these, the first Reformers found them, and justly concluded it safest to lay them aside, as too much to be allowed Favourites out of our own head, without the express Declaration of the Princes Will. But if he cannot shew that God allows them these things, it will be the safest way, and no hurt for him or us, to let them alone.

§ 6. His third Answer or pretence is no less insufficient: where he alledges, that the *Angels must know our affairs*, because they are *ministring Spirits*, sent forth for the good of those who shall be heirs of *Salvation*; and because they rejoice at the *Conversion of sinners*: and have glorified *Saints* no *Communication or Intelligence with the Angels*; p. 13. To which I answer, That these allegations neither justify the Invocation, nor the worship of Angels or Saints. It is true, the Angels are ministring Spirits; but we neither know which of them are assigned to minister unto us, nor when they are present. These things depend altogether on the immediate Will of God; and therefore it is to Him not Them we are to apply ourselves; if we would obtain their Care and Ministry for our good. 'Tis true likewise, that the *Saints and Angels rejoice at our Conversion*, when that Conversion comes to their knowledge. But that place in *St. Luke 15. 7.* I say unto you, Joy shall be in Heaven over one sin-

ner that repents, more than over ninety nine *just Persons*, doth no more prove that the Angels in Heaven know all the Conversions on Earth, or that we ought to pray to them; than my saying, That there is more joy in *Rome* over one such Profelite as Mr. *M.* than over ninety nine born *Roman Catholicks*, doth prove that I believe such Conversions are all known there; and that therefore Mr. *M.* may go into his Closet, and pray to the Cardinals, because it is plain his Affairs are known at *Rome*. Lastly, 'Tis true, that the glorified Saints have Communication with the Angels, and may receive intelligence of our Affairs from them; and therefore I would advise Mr. *M.* to send his Service and Requests to them by the next Angel he meets going that way. But because Angels pass and repass from Heaven to Earth, to conclude that we may at all times, and in all places, with mind and voice pray to Saints, is as foolish, as to conclude, because we have Posts pass from *London* to *Dublin*, that therefore a Man here may beg the assistance of his Friends Prayers who are in *London*, every time he goes to his knees. This is the wise Vindication Mr. *M.* has made for his Church, as to the Direction of some of her Prayers.

§ 7. The second thing which Mr. *M.* undertakes to vindicate in his Church, is her using a Tongue unknown to the People in all her publick Devotions, and Services. And it happens to him in this, as it does in most other things; if all that he says were granted him, it would neither justify his Church, nor condemn the Reformation; since not one of his Arguments so much as pretend, to prove a known Tongue unlawful in the publick Service of God, or an unknown Tongue expedient: which will appear on the Examination. He alledges therefore, 1. *That the Objection of its being said in the Latin Tongue, allows every one to hear it that understands Latin.* A great favour indeed. Who can after this, accuse the *Roman Church* of keeping Men ignorant of her Service? It is plain from our very Objection that they may hear it, if they but understand *Latin*; and 'tis their own fault if they do not understand it: 'Tis only spending seven or eight years to acquire the *Latin Tongue*, and then they may understand some part

part of her Service. But pray what is this to the illiterate World, who are past the age of learning *Latin*? What is this to the Poor, who are the bulk of the World, and have the best and most peculiar Title to the Gospel; and yet have neither capacity nor opportunity to learn *Latin*? Mr. *M.* bids them be of good cheer: *For unlearned Catholicks, if the truth were known, understand as much or more of the Mass, than illiterate Protestants do of the Common Prayer.* If a Man were apt to give ill words, the confidence and palpable falshood of this Assertion would certainly provoke him. It were better surely to believe *nothing but our Senses*, which he falsely imputes to some Protestants, than to undertake to face down Sense and Experience, in a matter in which the meanest, most illiterate Protestant in the World, will be a Demonstration against him. We are content our People should believe all Mr. *M.* says, according as they find this true. But he objects farther, *What does the Protestant Multitude understand of the Predictions of Isaiah, &c. read in their Churches by appointment of the Common Prayer?* Suppose they understood not one word of them: how doth it follow, that unlearned Catholicks understand more of the Mass, than illiterate Protestants do of the Common-Prayer Book? This is a new Instance of Mr. *M.*'s old Infirmary, in drawing Consequences. We are now talking of Common Prayers, in which the People ought to joyn: and he talks of the Lessons, which are no part of them. There are commonly in every Congregation, persons of better and of meaner capacity; 'tis fit both should be instructed. Those Lessons out of *Isaiah* are for the better capacities, and are read so, as may make them most easie to them. And what great matter, if the weaker, for whom they are not intended, do not understand them, since they are sufficiently provided for otherwise. Their obscurity might be some reason against reading them at all; but if they ought to be read, as is ordered both by the Common-Prayer Book and Breviary, I hope they will be better understood in *English* than *Latin*: And yet after all, there is not one Lesson ordered to be read by the Common-Prayer Book, but the meanest of the Protestant Multitude understands more of

it, then a whole illiterate Popish Congregation understands of the Breviary, or Mass; and of this he may make an Experiment when he pleases.

His second Allegation in behalf of his Church is, that she has set forth Expositions of the Mass in Print. *How many Expositions of the Mass* (says he) *are extant in Print by Commandment of the Church?* So that no Man can be ignorant of it that desires to be informed. To this I answer, That if by an Exposition be meant a Translation of the Mass, there is not one extant in Print by Commandment of their Church. On the contrary, the Congregation of the Index have Damned the very hours of the blessed Virgin, for being in the Vulgar Tongue; as may be seen at large in *Saint Amours Journal, Part. 3. Chap. 5.* There is indeed a Translation stolen out of late in English, but it is without any Authority, which may be called a Commandment of their Church. However, if it were set out by her Authority, what could it signifie to the greater part of the People, who are neither able to procure nor read that Translation? And if they could read it, yet would no more be able by help of it to joyn with the Priest, then by any other Devotional Book. Lastly, What is this to the Reformation, which found not one Exposition in Print by Commandment of the Church, nor any counted necessary? I will venture to put one Question to Mr. M. and having askt so many, I hope he will not take it ill. Ought the Mass to be understood by the People, or no? If it ought to be understood, why is not the best method taken to make them understand it; even to read it in a Tongue understood by them? If it matters not, whether it be understood by the People or no; to what purpose doth he talk of an Exposition?

His third Argument in behalf of the practice of his Church, is taken from the Example of the Jewish Church. *Had not* (saith he) *the Jewish Church almost all her Scriptures and publick Service for fourteen Generations; that is to say, from the Captivity unto Christ in the old Hebrew? A Language not then understood by the common People.* I Answer, she had some of them in old Hebrew,

brew, but not only in it. They were read in the Synagogues, first in *Hebrew*, for the use of the Learned; and then in the *Vulgar*, for the common People. This he might have learnt from Father (a) *Simon*, (b) and Bishop *Walton*: Nay (c) Doctor *Isaac Vossius* is positive, that the *Greek* was the vulgar Language of *Jerusalem* in our Saviours time; and that the *Septuagint* Translation, and not the old *Hebrew*, was read in the Synagogues of the *Jews*. And all unanimously conclude, that the people either understood the original of what was read, or were made understand it by an Interpreter. 'Tis probable, Saint *Paul*, had respect to this custom among the *Jews*, when he commands the Prophet that spake with Tongues to keep silence in the Church, if there was no Interpreter, 1 Cor. 14. 28. And therefore Mr. M. has quite mistaken his Argument, when he asks, Did our Saviour or his Apostles ever reprehend the *Jews* — for not translating the Scripture into the vulgar Language? There was no ground for such a Reprehension, since the *Jews* had done it three hundred years before; & therefore will rise up in Judgment against the absurd practice of the *Roman Church*, & will condemn her; who is more unkind to her Subjects than the very *Jews*, & has provided worse for their Edification in this point. It is to no purpose to say as Mr. M. doth, that the *Latine* is more vulgar than the *Englisb*: Since this is a manifest falshood, and must be owned to be such, by all men who consider that the *Latine* is not vulgar in any place of the World.

I cannot tell whether I can call it a fourth Argument which offers, in these words, *If the Service of God must be said in the maternal tongue of every Nation, where shall an English man in France or Spain, that understands not the language, go to serve God on the Lords day?* I answer, To Church, and joyn his presence and private Devotion with the Congregation; since he cannot joyn in the publick Prayers. In case of necessity, a man is accepted by God according to what he can do; and what is not in his power, is not required.

(a) Critical History of the Old Testament lib. 2. chap. 18 p. 123. London, 1682.

(b) Proleg. 12. sect. 7. p. 83.

(c) De sibyllinis c. 16. p. 184. Lond. 1684. Et plenius ad Iterat. p. Simonis obj. Resp. p. 376. & 377.



required of him. In a Country where there are no Christians, he must go no where; and in a strange Country, he must go to the publick Devotions, though he do not understand them: For that is better then not going at all.

His last Argument for the vindication of the publick Service of the Church in an unknown Tongue is, *That this would destroy all Community of Sacraments and Liturgie, between the Members of the Catholick Church; which being one Body or Society of Men, cannot be like the Builders of Babel, who could not understand one anothers Language.* Now if they that understand not one anothers language are Builders of Babel; then the Priest and People, where the Service is in an unknown Tongue, are plainly such Builders: For they do not understand one another. Two Cities may very well be Built, and conveniently Governed by two People of different Languages; and these Cities may likewise manage all their common Business, and keep a good Correspondence, by the help of a few Men that understand both Languages. But two Languages in the same City is very inconvenient, and cannot be so remedied; It is so in the Church: Distant Congregations may have a very good Communion with one another by the help of their Priests who understand a common Language: But to have a Language spoken to a Congregation, or in it, that the Members cannot understand, is to bring in a great confusion, and directly opposite to the Apostles command, which he himself here produces, *Rom. 15. 16. that we should with one mind and mouth glorifie God:* For how can a Congregation glorifie God with one mouth, if they do not understand the words in which they are to joyn? Thus Mr. M's Arguments constantly make against himself. If want of a common Language destroys unity of Sacraments and Liturgy, in distant Churches, it destroys that unity much more where there is wanting a common Language between the Priest & People in the same Church. But the truth is, the unity of the Sacraments and Liturgies, have no dependency on the unity of Language; but are the same in whatever language they are used or administred. And so it was in the Primitive Church, where every  
 People

People had their own Liturgy in their own Language. Mr. M. foresaw that 1 Cor. 14. would be objected against him: And he tells us, p. 11. *That he humbly thinks it not well understood by Protestants.* This is a main point; and one would have expected a substantial Reason for his Opinion, some Determination of a Primitive Council, or a whole shoal of Fathers at least: But instead of that, he pretends to cut the throat of the Objection out of that very Chapter, in which Protestants glory. *If any be Ignorant* (saith he) *let him be Ignorant. Wherefore Brethren, covet to Prophecie, and forbid not to speak with Tongues, v. 39. God is not the Author of Confusion but Peace, v. 33.* I shall not trouble the Reader with an Answer to these Arguments; if Mr. M. designed in earnest to prove by them, that we do not well understand the Apostle in this Chapter, I would advise him to take the Opinion of a Physician, whether all be right about his Head.

§ 8. The third thing wherein Mr. M. endeavours to vindicate his Church is the Worship of Images. And to this purpose he alleges, First, *That the Council of Trent hath commanded all Superstition to be taken away in the use of Images; and then gives it in charge to all Bishops to look to it, p. 12.* If they had reckoned the Worship of Images Superstition, this had indeed taken away our Objection, but on the contrary; the Council decreed that Images of Christ, not of his Human Nature, (as he improperly expresses it) and likewise of the Blessed Virgin, and other Saints, are to be had and retained, especially in Churches, and due Honour and Worship is to be paid them. And that we ought to kiss, uncover our Heads, and fall prostrate before them.

§ 9. But then, Secondly, He bids us enquire whether Roman Catholics pay any more respect to them, than Protestants do to the Elements of Bread and Wine, which (say they) are but a Figure or Image of Christs Body and Blood. To which I answer, That this Enquiry supposes two notorious Falshoods: First, That Protestants pay any other respects to the Elements of Bread and Wine, then that of not diverting them from their Sacramental use. And Secondly, That they say the Elements are but a Figure or Image of Christ.

*Christ's Body and Blood.* Our Church having declared in her Rubrick after the Communion, that the kneeling at the Reception of the Sacrament, is only to Christ; and that *no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine*: and likewise concerning the Elements, that they are not *only Signs or Images*, but *effectual-means* of conveying the *Body and Blood of Christ to the Faithful*. Which I hope no *Papist* will say of his Images. And now I must refer it to the Reader, whether he will suppose Mr. *M.* to have been ignorant of our Doctrine in this point, or to have knowingly, and against his Conscience, suggested these falsehoods.

§ 10. His third attempt for the Defence of his Church in this Practice, is from his old Friends the Presbyterians. *The Church of England Protestants are every jot as offensive to us (say the Presbyterians) kneeling before the Elements of Bread and Wine, as the Papists kneeling before the Image of Christ.* To which I answer, That if the Matter of Fact here alledged, were true, (which I do not believe,) yet it were no Argument; because the *Presbyterians*, or whosoever are thus offended, are manifestly unreasonable in paralleling these two cases. The Disparity is apparent, and the very same that there is between receiving a Pardon, or any other signal Favour from the Kings own Hand on my knees; and falling down every time I see his Picture on a Sign-post.

But once for all, let Mr. *M.* know, (for he professes to need Information,) that it is is no Answer to an Argument, to pretend that others urge it against the Proponents themselves; except the Answerer shew that both urge it with equal Reason. For so the Apostles might have been answered by a Heathen. You would persuade us, that we are under the *Power of Satan*, and *Aliens to the Life of God*: Do not the *Gnosticks* say the same of you? Silence them, and we will believe you. So a *Roman Catholick* may be answered by an *Indian*, You would have us renounce our Idols and Heroes; whereas there is a People amongst yourselves, called *Protestants*, to whom your *kneeling before the Images of Christ*, and praying to Saints, *are every jot as offensive* as our praying to  
our

our subordinate Celestial Powers and Kneeling before their Images. If this would signifie nothing to Mr M. why should it signifie any thing to us what Presbyterians object against our Kneeling at the Reception of the Sacrament? or how are we concerned, what *they pretended in 41*, against our Reformation, or *Hugh Peters in 47*, against theirs? except he will undertake to justify their Pretences, which is a Task themselves could never perform.

§ 11. There is onely one thing more he says in vindication of his Church; and that *concerns the ill Practices* we charge on *some* Roman Catholicks, and *the ill Opinions of others*. He doth not deny that there are some such, but *he looks on it as no Argument at all*. If so, he wrote his Books to very little purpose; for why are we more concerned in the ill Practices or ill Opinions of some who pretend to Reform, than he is in the ill Practices and Opinions of the Pope and Court of *Rome*? Yet these pretended faults of the Reformers, make up the greatest part of what he Objects against our Church; which shews that he has one Rule for us, and another for his own Party. But the truth is, we charge the Council of *Trent* it self with some *ill Practices and Opinions*. For tho' we take *Popery* as the most judicious Papists *represent it*, (and they who bring the Decrees of the Council of *Trent* nearest to Protestantism, I find are at present counted such) yet still there needs better Vouchers than Mr M. to make us believe all things in it *Judicious and Pious*.

§ 12. Having thus examined all that he has said in defence of his Church, let us next consider what he has offered to recommend Her: And of this nature he produces three instances: The Excellency of her Books of Devotion; the Devotion of her People; and the Unity of her Members. He tells us, p. 9. that, *that which obliged him most of all to the Church of Rome, was the perusal of her Books of Devotion; such as St. Francis Sales* — Neirem-

bergius — Lewis Granatensis — *especially the Mass is self.* If these obliged him most of all, had he lived at the Reformation, he had wanted some of the strongest obligations to keep him in the *Roman* Communion; three of these four he mentions being written after the Reformation, and the other but a few years before. And now they are written, he was not debarred the use of them in the Communion in which he lived. The Spirit of the Reformation, which he says he compared without prejudice, with the Spirit of the *Roman* Church, allowing the use of all Books that may advance Piety, by whomsoever they are written, which the Spirit of his Church doth not: But what is this to the Reformation, which did not find, much less condemn these Books? Let him shew one Book of Devotion, or Exposition of the Mass, or Breviary, extant in *English* before the Reformation, if he can; and remember what has been done since, to the eternal shame of those, who never troubled themselves with Devotion, till meer necessity of supporting their interest among the People put them on it. As for the Piety of the Prayers in the Mass, let him who understands, both compare any Prayer there with our *Litany*, and 'tis hardly possible Prejudice should so blind him, as not to see which has the advantage.

§ 13. But, nevertheless, he alledges, that the Devotion of their People exceeds ours. *Let the Reader compare that Devotion which Catholics pay to the Sacrifice of the Mass, with that which most Protestants shew to the Common-Prayer, and then see how much better we are by Reforming the Mass into English, p. 11.* To which I answer, That if it were granted, that Papists appear to be more devote at Mass, than Protestants at Church (for that I suppose he means by paying Devotion to the *Mass*, and shewing it to the *Common-Prayer*) yet it would not follow that the Mass were better than the Common-Prayer, or a fitter means of Devotion; since that difference might arise from other motives,



as it manifestly doth. The *Roman* Catholics place much more Religion in outward shew, than the Protestants, and therefore no wonder if they be more diligent in it.

2. If the appearance of Devotion at publick Service be an Argument of the goodness of the Service, the *Turks* who out do the generality of Christians in frequency, seeming Devotion, and Reverence at their Prayers, as we are informed by Travellers, must be concluded to have the best Service: and he would do ill on Mr *M's* Principles that would Reform the *Alcoran* into the *Mass*.

3. The matter of Fact is not true, as I am informed by those that have seen their Communicants and ours. Protestants have according to Mr *M's* desire, compared the Devotions of the Church of *Rome* with those of the Church of *England*, in a Discourse designed for that very purpose, and Printed, *London*, 1685: In which it is shewn, *That whatever the Romanists pretend, there is not so true Devotion among them, nor such rational provision for it, nor encouragement to it, as in the Church established by Law among us.*

4. It is not material what their Devotions appear to be, if their Lives are not better than ours, which I am sure they are not. Open Prophaneness is hardly more provoking to God, than shew of Devotion without proportional Sanctity of Life, as we learn from the Case of the *Jews* of old, in *Isa. 1. Jer. 7.* and in many other places of Scripture.

§ 14. The third thing whereby he endeavours to recommend his Church, is the Unity of her Members: *In the Church of Rome he shall find variety of Religious Orders, but no Schism, nor Discord about their Sacraments or Liturgy: In the Garment of the Church, there is Variety, but no Rent: No confusion of Sects, nor Disobedience to Superiors.* p.

14. If this be true, she is the happiest Church that ever was in the World; much happier than the Church of the Apostles time: for there were Schisms and Discords about Sacraments and Liturgy in her. Witness the Apostle, 1

*Corin.* I. II. also I. 18. Nay, there was Disobedience too; *Gal.* 3. 1. 3 *Joh.* 9. It is therefore strange we should be able to find none in the Church of *Rome*. May we not rather conclude that Mr *M.* has either partially, or negligently sought for these Schisms and Discords? Since really there has hardly been greater Schisms and Discords in any Church than in her, tho' he affirms we shall find none.

\* *Bellarmino* loved the Church of *Rome* as well as Mr *M.* and he owns twenty six Schisms in her. † *Onuphrius Panvinius*, who uses not to speak ill of the *Roman* Church, reckons thirty; one he calls the worst and longest, which continued fifty Years, others were of twenty, or fifteen, or ten, &c. These Authors onely reckon those Schisms where the People were divided between two Popes: But it were easie to shew, that besides these there were in that Church great and enormous Schisms, which had no Popes to head them. And as for Discords about Sacraments, I suppose, Mr *M.* reckons Ordination a Sacrament: And concerning it there have been many Discords; many Popes have damned their Predecessors, and annulled their Ordinations. So *Stephen VII.* nulled the Ordinations of *Formosus* his Predecessor. *John IX.* did as much for *Stephen*, and *Sergius III.* for him. \* *Platina* tells us, That after the time of *Stephen VI.* or, as others reckon, the VII. it became a Custom for the succeeding Popes to infringe, or quite destroy the Acts of their Predecessors. † *Spondanus* tells us, These are the unhappy times, wherein every intruding Pope annulled the Acts of his Predecessors. And further, that the power of Whores was so great in *Rome*, that they removed true and lawful Popes, and thrust in violent and wicked men. Who, considering

\* See his Chronology ad ann.

1439

† See his Chronicon Pontificum ad ann. 1373.

\* Cum postea fere semper servata hac consuetudo sit ut a priorum Pontificum, sequentes aut infringerent, aut omnino tollerent. *Plat. de Vita Pontif. in Joh. 6.*

† *Spond. ad ann. 908. Scil. 2.* Hancq; tantum invaluit metuetum imperium, ut pro arbitrio legitime creatos Pontifices dimoverent, & violentos ac nefarios homines intruderent. Quæ considerans, quis non putaret Deum oblitum Ecclesiæ suæ? *Spond. ubi supra Scil. 3.*

*dering this, would not think God had forgotten his Church?* Behold the Mission of the *Roman* Bishops, and their Unity. And if notwithstanding these Schisms and Intrusions; which continued for many years, the Church of *Rome* continued a true Church, and her Ordinations valid; let the Reader judge, what there is so Horrid or Irregular in our Reformation, that should void our Orders, or make us cease to be a Church.

§ 15. I suppose Mr. M. counts Confirmation another Sacrament; and there have been no less discords about it of late in the *Roman* Church. The Regulars of *England* on one side, and the Bishops of *France*, with the *Sorborn* on the other. And those of each party charge the other with *Herefie*, not without the disturbance of the publick Peace, and a rent of brotherly Charity. So the Congregation of the *Index* tells us: which Congregation made a Decree to suppress the Writings of both Parties, May 19. 1633. And here we do not find that *Obedience to Superiors* in this matter of which Mr. M. boasts: for immediately there came out at *Paris* a Disquisition against the Decree, the Jesuits Reply, and the Bishops of *France* renew their Condemnation and Censure, Nov. 29. 1643. and I do not find that they are yet agreed. Mr. M. affirms we shall find *no Rent*, *no Confusion of Sects*, *no Disobedience to Superiors* in the Church of *Rome*. But whosoever will read the Decrees and passages about this matter, in St. Amours's Collection at the end of his *Journal*, p. 26. or in *Petrus Aurelius's Vindiciæ Censuræ*, will find a great rent of brotherly Charity, much Confusion, and great Disobedience in the disagreeing Parties; and these about no less things, than the Sacrament of Confirmation, the Hierarchy of the Church, and Supremacy of St. Peter.

§ 16. Confession is no less a Sacrament with Mr. M. and the Disputes in his Church have of late been as high about it, as about the former; one Parry charging the other:

ther with no less than Heresie : as may be seen at large in the Bishops of *France's* Letter to *Innocent* the X. at the end of Mr. *Arnauld's* Book of Frequent Communion. If their publick Acts are to be believed, there are Rents, *Scissurae fraternae Charitatis* in their Church. But if we believe Mr. *M.* there is no Rent, *Scissura non est*. I shall say nothing of the Dispute concerning the Regale in *France* at this day; I need not put him in mind of what Obedience has been paid to the Pope, or to his Excommunications of the Arch-bishop of *Toulouse*, and Regalists. He may see the whole in a Book intituled, *Regale Sacerdotum*, 1684. I do not see but the King and Church of *France* make themselves Judge, Witness, and Accuser in this Affair with the Pope, as much as *Henry VII.* and the *English* Church did.

§ 17. This is all that Mr. *M.* seems to say, either to vindicate or recommend his Church. Let us see next what he objects against ours. And in all this last part I can find only three things of this nature: One is P. 10, That the Church of England is beholding to the Mass for the best Flowers in her Communion Service. The second is, that the Protestant Church has no other Foundation, than every man's Reason. And the third is, That we do not pay a due Submission to the Church. As to the first of these, I suspect the chief reason, why some of his Party object the Communion Service, being taken out of the Mass; is not that they think it any fault if it were; but because they believe it may gratifie and incense their Friends, the Nonconformists, against the publick Service of the Church. But I answer, That the Model of our Service, and Materials thereof, are not taken out of the Mass, but out of the ancient Liturgies of the Church, to which it is much more conformable than to the Mass.

§ 18. The second Objection he brings against our Church is, That she hath no sufficient Foundation: P. 11, I desire to be informed whether the Protestant Church had a-

ny other Foundation (*setting aside an Act of Parliament*) than every Man's own Reason; or which is the same thing, the Scriptures Interpreted by every Man's Reason? There are but two Bases whereupon to settle our selves, the Scriptures and Fathers expounded by my own Reason; or the Scriptures and Fathers expounded by the voice of the present visible Church. This later is Popish, and cannot support a Reformed Fabrick. In answer to this, I will shew, first, in what Sence every Man's Reason, may be said to be the foundation of his Church. Secondly, That our Church has trusted her Reason in the expounding Scriptures and Fathers, no farther than she ought to have done. And Thirdly, That she has not Expounded them so as to contradict the sence of the present visible Church.

First therefore, When Mr. *M.* alledges that our Church has no other Foundation than every Man's Reason, he may mean that she has no other Foundation for her Religion, than what natural Reason, without the assistance of Revelation, and other helps God has afforded her, doth suggest. And this is a manifest Calumny, because she has, besides what natural Reason of it self suggests, the Scriptures, the Fathers, the universal Tradition of all Ages past, and present, for every Article of her Faith. Let him shew one Article that wants any one of these, and we will strike it out of our Creeds; or any other Article that has this testimony for its necessity, and it shall be inserted.

There may be another sence of these words, The Protestant Church has no other Foundation than every man's Reason: and 'tis this, The Protestants make use of no other faculties, to find out the sence of Scriptures and Fathers, of the former and present Church, but their Reason and Senses: and consequently rely on them with God's assistance, to find out the true Religion and Church. This Sence we allow, and except Mr. *M.* and his Party, will shew us some other faculties, given us by God, whereby we may



may choose our Religion; they ought not to blame us for using these only. When they find out another faculty of the Soul, besides these two, whereby we may distinguish Truth from Falshood, we promise them to use it also. And though Mr. M. confesses his own Reason, to be as weak as any body can think it and pretends not to assert it, but the Authority of the Church: yet, till he tells us by what faculties he judges himself obliged to submit to the Authority of the Church, and by what faculties he comes to know that the Roman Church is she, to whose Authority he ought to submit; we must tell him, that the Authority of his Church, as to him, is founded meerly and solely on his own Reason, how weak soever he own it. And so must the Authority of every Church, to every man in the World. And therefore it is foolish to object, That the Protestant Church has no other Foundation than every Man's Reason and Sences; for no Church, no not Christianity, has or can have any other.

§ 19. But Secondly, Perhaps Mr. M. means only that we do not allow the voice of the present visible Church a due regard in our Determination, concerning Faith and Religion. In Answer to which, in the second place, I say, our Church trusted her reason no further in expounding Scripture than she ought to have done. And here it is to be remembered, that she is a compleat Church, associated together in one intire Ecclesiastical Body, with full power to Interpret and Teach her Subjects, all things relating to Faith and Discipline: As these Kingdoms are a compleat Common-wealth, associated into one civil Body, with full power to Interpret and Enact all things relating to the Law of Nature, and the Civil Government of the Kingdoms. As therefore these Kingdoms do not trust their Reason too far, when they determine concerning the Laws of Nature without Appeal; so neither did our Church trust her Reason too far, when she determined without Appeal

**Appeal**, concerning matters relating to Faith. And there is no more inconvenience can befall her Subjects, by allowing her this power in this case, than can befall them, by allowing their Civil Majestates the like power in the other.

§ 20. And third, to shew that she did not intend to contradict the general voice of the visible Church, with which Mr. M. seems to charge her; she was content to refer all difference between her and her Neighbour Churches to the Arbitration of a general Council, even of the *West*. And to this she Appealed, when the Pope pretended to Excommunicate her. And not only she, but other Protestant Churches did the same. But the *Roman* Church being Confiscous, that the general Voice and Sense of the visible Church, was against her Usurpation, durst not stand this Tryal; but without any Authority from God, or the visible Church (if we understand by that the general Body of Christians) took on her self to be Judge, Witness, and Accuser. Which was more than *Luther* did; for he referred himself, and Appealed to a general Council.

§ 21. The third Objection Mr. M. alledges against the Reformers, is, their not yielding a due Submission to the Church. For after all his clamour against Reason, he allows us to make use of it with Submission; he has expressed his meaning in this, so as it is not easie to guess, whether he means by submitting our reason, an intire resignation of it, to beleive whatsoever the Church of *Rome* by a Priest, or a Council tells us, and then the only use of reason will be to find out Arguments to defend what she has taught us; or whether by Submission he means only a due regard to her Determinations, so that a Man of her Communion shall not allow himself publicly to oppose and contradict her Doctrine. This last he seems to understand by Submission; because he opposes it to *Contraddition* and *Petulance*. And then why is not this Sub-

mission due as much to the Church of *England* and *Ireland* as *Rome*? Did not Christ say to the Bishops of *England* and *Ireland*, *He that hears you hears me*; as well at to the Bishop of *Rome*?

§ 22. But to clear this matter a little, I will shew that we pay all due Submission to the Church. And, Secondly, Examine what Submission Mr *M.* has paid her. When we talk of Submission to the Church, by the Church may be meant either the Universal Church, or the Particular Church wherein we were Born, Baptized, and Educated: and to both these we profess and pay due Submission. Witness of the Doctrine of Christ, and we receive her Testimony. The onely Question with us is, What Doctrine Christ and his Apostles Taught? And this we believe contained in the Scriptures. Concerning the Sence of any Word in them, we receive likewise the Testimony of the Catholick Church. Every Doctor approved by her, is a Witness, and every Council received by her, is as the Deposition of Witnesses. By this means we know her Sence in former Ages, as well as in this Age, and are able to compare them together. Where these agree, we have no reason to doubt her Veracity; but where one Age of her says one thing, and another Age says another thing; we count our selves under no obligation to believe either of their Testimonies to be a necessary part of the Doctrine of Christ. 'Tis therefore the Church of all Ages, and places, that we reckon the *Ground and Pillar of Truth*. Whereas Mr *M.* confines us to the Visible Church, and pretends we are to take the Sence of all former Ages, from the present. But pray why may not I as well understand the Sence of the Church of the fourth Age from the Council of *Nice*, as I can understand the Sence of the last Age from the Council of *Trent*? It was therefore by this Rule, and with Submission to his Church, that our Reformers pro-

proceeded in their Reformation: and except Mr *M.* can shew (which he has not so much as endeavoured to do) that they deviated from this Rule, he has done nothing to prove that they had not a due Deference and Submission to the Catholick Church. And as she thus submitted to the Sence of the Universal Church, so she requires all her Subjects to submit to her, to receive the Faith, to which she, with the Catholick Church, bears Testimony, to own her Laws of Discipline, submit to her Censures, and conform to her Constitutions. But she pretends to no Dominion over mens Faith, or to oblige them to believe any thing, because she has decreed it: Her Authority is to propose as a Witness, not to define as a Judge. If any one dissent from her, he must not make a Schism, or turn Preacher in contradiction to her Authority: If any one be otherwise minded, he must follow the Apostle's Rule, *Phil.* 3. 15. he must conform as far as he can, and yield a Passive Obedience to her Censures, where he cannot give an Active to her Commands. While he walks by this Rule, he can neither be a Schismatic nor Heretick; and may expect, if he use due means, that God will either reveal to him what he wants, or pardon his Errour if he mistake.

§ 23. This Submission is coherent even with Calvin's Principles: And though I am not concerned for any private Divine, yet since Mr *M.* has troubled us with so few Quotations, I will pay him so much Respect as to take notice of this; and the Reader may from it learn how faithfully he Transcribes and *Englishesth* his Quotations.

The Quotation as in Calvin: As Transcribed by Mr *M.*

<i>Non aliud est in vitam ingressus nisi nos ipsa concipiat in utero, nisi nos</i>	<i>Extra Ecclesie gremium nulla speranda Salus, nec Remissio peccatorum, quia non</i>
<i>alat</i>	<i>M 2</i>
	<i>est</i>

alac suis uberibus— Adde est alium in vian lingrefq  
quod extra ejus gremium nūc fuit: non has non (which he  
la speranda est peccatorum zist non debent non that they  
remiffio, nec ulla falus— Lib. a non had they or  
4. Cap. 1. Sect. 4. And as the Catholic Church

Thus in English literally.

Thus rendered into English  
by Him.

There is no other Passage into Life, except the *Womb* of the Church conceive us in Life, detumescit the her Womb, bring us forth, Pride of his own Reason, and nourish us with her and humbly cast himself at Breasts— Add to this, the Feet of the Catholic Church— That out of her Bosom there is no Remission of Sins to be expected, nor any Salvation.

Both Calvin and we own that Pride, and all other Passions, ought to be Mortified: And except Mr. M. can shew that we have used our Reason proudly, that is, not yielded, out of some design, Passion or Prejudice, when our Reason was convinced, we have just reason to reckon all his Accusations effects of his own Passion, and Petulance against his Mother Church. He confesses that many of us are Catholics by Inclination; (I hope we are really so) but the Tyranny of Prejudice, or Interest keeps us Protestants. But for Prejudice, let the World judge, whether our People are more liable to Prejudice, who are allowed to Read, and Examine, and Judge for themselves; or the Members of his Church, that are taught to submit without Examination. As for Interest; I think it is the Interest of every man to continue Protestant, if he value his Soul: but for Worldly Interest, the Scales are hardly equal. I find not one of their Converts who has lost  
by



by it yet. But whatever our Interest is, our Loyalty is unquestionable; if *he know divers Loyal Persons of the Church of England, I know none else.*

§ 24. Let us now take a view of his Submission to the Church. 1. For the Catholick Church, he has taken the liberty to cut off from her, what Members he thought fit; and has reduced her to a fourth part of Christians: He has obtruded Articles of Faith on her, to which she never gave Testimony; and has subjected her to a Head at Rome, to whom God never subjected her; that is, He has created a Catholick Church out of his own head, and rejected that of Christ's Planting.

2. As for the Particular Church, which made him a Member of Christ by Baptism, this his spiritual Mother, he has pronounced a Harlot, and her Children *By Whores*; He has condemned her Sacraments, degraded her Bishops, to whom he swore Obedience, renounced her Orders, and given her the Title of an *unsanctified Nation*. In short, as far as lay in his Power, he has exposed the Nakedness of his Mother. Behold the *Perulancy, and Contradiction* of an undutiful Son. But thanks be to God, notwithstanding his feeble Attempts, *Her Row abides in strength, and the Arms of her Hands are made strong, by the Hands of the Mighty God of Jacob, Gen. 49. 24.*

CHAP.

## C H A P. VI.

**A**lthough Mr. M. hath nothing new in his Latine Addition, but only repeats what he said; first in his Preface, and then in his Book; yet, I did not think it fit, to let what he has said in this Language, be without some Animadversions in the same.

*Ad dubia quæ proponuntur super Reformatione Anglicana, sic respondetur.*

*Ad 1. An Ecclesia Anglicana sit tota Ecclesia?*

*Resp.* Quam absurdum sit ut una particularis Ecclesia sit esse totam Catholicam Christi Ecclesiam, extra quam non est salus, impudenter jactet, videant Romanenses. Ecclesia Anglicana membrum duntaxat Ecclesiæ Catholicæ sese existimat: Omnium Ecclesiarum Sacramenta à Christo instituta amplectitur, dummodo in unitate fidei, in materia debita, & sub formâ præscriptâ celebrentur. An Nos, vel ipsius Ecclesiæ Romanæ Baptismum rejicimus? aut an illa nostrum non recipit?

*Ad 2. Num Ecclesia Anglicana recipit Sacramenta Lutheranorum, &c.*

*Resp.* Sacramenta Lutheranorum, &c. Vera esse Sacramenta; & forte solus est Mr. M. qui aliter sentit. Sacramenta non sunt eorum Sacramenta, à quibus celebrantur; sed Christi & Ecclesiæ: sicut nos docuit sanctus Augustinus contra Donatistas Ep. 48. *Non in vobis mutamus in quibus estis nobiscum* — *Nobiscum autem estis in Baptismo, in Symbolo, in cæteris Dominicis Sacramentis, & paulo ante, ex Catholicâ enim Ecclesiâ sunt omnia Dominica Sacramenta quæ sic habetis & datis, quemadmodum habebantur & dabantur, etiam prius quam inde exiretis; non tamen ided non habetis quia ibi non estis, unde sunt quæ habetis,*

letis, hæc ille de Sacramentis Hæreticorum. Donatista itaque est, qui Sacramentum rejicit, quia à Schismaticis celebrari putat; multo magis qui eorum Sacramenta rejicit, qui fidem Catholicam profitenter, & se studiosos unitatis Ecclesiasticæ, & fraternæ Charitatis exhibent.

Ad 3. *Unde missus est Cranmerus ad prædicandum Evangelium suum Reformatum?*

*Resp.* A Christo missus est *Cranmerus* per manus Episcoporum Angliæ secundum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ institutionem ad prædicandum, non suum, sed Christi Evangelium: probandum igitur est, Evangelium Reformatum aliud esse à Christi Evangelio, priusquam mandatum Missionis excessisse dicatur *Cranmerus*. *Contra Ecclesiam Romanam non rebellavit*, quoniam illi jure subjectus non erat, neque ab ea Missionem aut jurisdictionem propriè recepit. Ecclesia quæ illum misit in communione erat cum Ecclesiâ Romanâ, non illi tamen subjecta, jure aliquo divino.

Ad 4. *An liceat Ministro ab Ecclesiâ Anglicanâ fugitivo prædicare contra eam, &c?*

*Resp.* Videat ipse, per quam Missionem publicè per hanc chartam prædicat contra Ecclesiam cui obedientiam juravit? Est enim & hoc, prædicationis genus efficacissimum.

Ad 5. *Utrum defectus Missionis sit error in Fundamentis?*

*Resp.* Si per Missionem intelligitur externa illa, quæ secundum Canones fit; defectus in eâ non est semper error in Fundamentis: multi enim Episcopi Romani ejusmodi Missionem caruerunt. Corcedo furti & Latrocinii reum esse, qui sine regulari externâ Missionem in ovile ingreditur; non tamen inde sequitur, omnia quæ facit aut mala aut nulla esse cum semel in ovile ingressus sit. Simoniacus aut intrusus fur est & latro; an igitur Sacramenta ab ipso celebrata nulla sunt aut invalida? Oportino tamen deest ei Missio interna, & defectus est in externâ.

Ad 6. *Utrum Cranmerus intravit per ostium Parliamenti?*

*Resp.*

*Resp.* Intravit invitus ( ut fere omnes boni Episcopi )  
per otium quod illi leges, tam Ecclesiasticæ quam Civiles,  
secundum sacras Scripturas, monitiaverunt. *Chm.* si  
modo possunt, dant cantilenam sectari, & si placuit illis  
pro Magistro Symphonie Mr. M. nunquam tamen Har-  
monie regulis respondebit eorum cantus. *Obicit nobis*  
*varium & Multiplicem Scripturæ sensum, sed immensito,*  
ipse enim si Christianus est, objectionem solvere tenetur,  
aut saltem interpretem assignare, qui verum Scriptura-  
rum sensum à falso hucusque discreverit, illumque verbis  
expresserit, quorum sensus non æque multiplex est, ac sen-  
sus Scripturarum. Ac obicit *hinc tali iudice altercari in*  
*æternum* necesse est: concedo equidem quod illi quibus  
ambitio & lucrum dominantur, in æternum altercabun-  
tur sub quovis iudice: nec aliter voluit Deus: æquum e-  
nim est, quod impii & superbi in Hæreses & Factiones  
libi permittantur, at boni & modesti sub pastoribus sibi  
à Christo assignatis vivant, sine altercationibus quæ uni-  
tatem scindunt.

Dicit 7. *Ad hæc postulata sæpius se quæsisse responsum,*  
*sed nullum hactenus invenisse.* A quibus hæc quæsit? An  
à nostris? Vix credo, nullum enim invenio, qui hæc il-  
lum quærentem audivit, aut somniavit; si igitur quæsi-  
verit, ab aliis certè, non a nostris (à quibus oportuit)  
quæsit, fortè a fratribus Monasticis quorum consortio  
per annum præteritum se totum dedit; non autem mire-  
mur aut illis desuisse responsum, aut si quod habuissent  
celasse. Addit tandem *responsum (quod dicit a multis ob-*  
*tendi solere) scilicet Cranmerum cum sodalibus ordines ac-*  
*cepisse à Christo per manus Episcoporum pontificiorum;* si per  
pontificios intelligit Episcopos in communione cum pon-  
tifice Romano, verum est at si per pontificios, intelligit  
Episcopos qui se Subjectos Papæ jure divino agnoverunt,  
æque falsum est quam quod maxime; ut igitur Christi-  
ani Episcopi, non ut pontificii, ordines conferendi pote-  
statem

statem habebant; qui aut sunt in assignandis sibi Sacerdotibus; qui etiam *ex antiquorum Christianorum*, non pontificum Episcopum considerant; qui tandem errores & corruptelas quæ in Divinis itropierant, secundum Scripturas sacras & sensum veterum reformaverunt; & hæc cura se veros pastores probant. *Audiendi itaque erunt*: & Mr. M. qui illos audire recusat, inter Rebelles filios numerandus est. Cum igitur primi Reformatores subiecti non essent pontifici, sed Co Episcopi, non magis *adversus Doctrinam Ecclesie Romanæ infingere* existimandi erant, quam Regnum Angliæ invaderet contra leges Gallie, si se & subditos & statum suum secundum leges naturæ reformaverit: nullus itaq; *hic nodus* nisi quem fallax Mr. M. imaginatio ligavit. Solus culpandus pontifex, qui revera *judicem resem & accusatorem* egit, & à sociis suis Episcopis quod jure suo utebantur, se & Ecclesiam suam abscidit, pacemq; cum illis soluit.

Ad 8. *An cuilibet Ecclesie nationali jus sese reformandi competat?*

*Resp.* Nihil contra objicit dubitator, nisi si ita se res habeat, tam pari jure reformatam fuisse gentem Scotticam ad Calvinismum, &c. quod nullo modo sequitur; non solum enim potestas quæ reformat, legitima esse sed etiam legitime procedere debet. At si quæ in illis gentibus circa reformationem illegitime facta fuissent, non erant corrigenda concitando factiones & schismata contra publicam earum Ecclesiarum pacem, nec privati in partes contra pastores sollicitandi (est enim illud remedium morbo periculosoq; perniciosius) sed ad meliorem frogem reducendæ erant errantes Ecclesie communi Christianitatis concilio & horratu; præsertim dum errores suos aliis non imposuerunt. Eo usque enim unitatem deseruisse non sunt estimande. Quod in Sancto Cypriano manifestum est, qui licet cum suo provinciali concilio in errorem lapsus est, & in eo usque ad terminum vite perseveravit, a schismate



tamen à Sancto Augustino in libris de Baptismo excusatur, quod nullum à jure, *Communione* si diversum senserit, amovebat; neq; Tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem co-  
legas suos adegit, quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentiâ  
libertatis, & potestatis suæ, arbitrium proprium, tamq; ju-  
dicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest judicare. Ut  
loquitur ipse Sanctus Cyprianus in Concilio Carthagini-  
ensi.

Existimat verò ille, falsum esse quod facta erat mutatio  
*Religionis* ex voto gentis, & Cleri Anglicani, sed ex verti-  
gine paucorum, & ad annales illorum temporum nos relegat.  
Ad eos itaq; eamus, indeq; manifestum erit, nullam mu-  
tationem majori consensu aut factam fuisse aut receptam,  
quàm Reformationem in Anglia. Si non favissent nobis  
annales illorum temporum, unde erat quòd tam sollicitè  
conquisiti, & aboliti sunt sub Maria, idq; per mandatum  
publicum. Ut videre est ex Rot. Pat.

Ad 9. *An licuit Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, cum esset membrum  
Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, semet abscindere à reliquo corpore?*

Resp. Nunquam semet abscidit; manet illi unita uni-  
tate fidei, & charitate. Regnum Angliæ membrum est  
societatis humanæ æque ac Ecclesia Anglicana est mem-  
brum Catholicæ: nec magis Ecclesia estimanda est semet  
abscindere à reliquo corpore, cum se pro jure suo refor-  
mat; quam regnum semet à societate humana abscinde-  
re, si ad suam reformationem Leges novas condit. Co-  
nata equidem est Ecclesia Romana nostram à communione  
Catholica abscindere, illi communionem suam denegan-  
do; ad respondere possumus quod Ecclesia Orientalis per  
Firmilianum, & Africana per Sanctum Cyprianum Ste-  
phano Episcopo Romano ipsas excommunicare nitenti, re-  
sponderunt. Ep. 75. *Peccatum quàm magnum tibi exagge-  
rasti, quando te à tot gregibus scidisti? excidisti enim te-  
ipsum, noli te fallere, dum enim putas omnes à te abstineri  
posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti.*

Ad 10. *An depravatus fuit per totum orbem verus Dei cultus ante ortum Cranmerum?*

*Resp.* Possunt ea in cultum divinum irrepere per universum orbem quæ reformatione indigeant; nec tamen inde sequitur cultum Dei verum tolli, aut depravari: manet autem verum, licet à scoriis non penitus purgatum sit.

Ad 11. *Utrum badia extra regnum Angliæ & Hiberniæ nullus extat purus & Apostolicus Dei cultus?*

*Resp.* Quod extat alibi talis cultus quoad essentialia: at forte neq; in Angliâ, neq; alibi tam purus asserendus est Dei cultus, ut nihil in eo quoad accidentalialia imperfectum inveniat; in ipsis Apostolicis Ecclesiis, viventibus adhuc Apostolis, multa indigebant reformatione, ut colligere possumus ab ipsâ scripturâ.

Ad 12. *An liceat populo Anglicano comminisci sibi Ecclesiam à toto orbe divisam?*

*Resp.* Non licere, neq; talem commentus est; è contra, omni Ecclesiæ veræ, Catholicâ fide & charitate, unita manet Ecclesia Anglicana. Qui nolunt cum illâ pacem, divisam sibi Ecclesiam commenti sunt. Nullius Ecclesiæ Sacramenta aut Ritus damnat, integrum Sacramentum Eucharistiæ suis restituit, superfluos & superstitiosos Ritus in rebus divinis abrogavit, & aliis Ecclesiis ut ubrogent, suadet; cum autem in eas potestatem non habeat, non est cur sibi damnandi illos officium arroget, sed (ut in simili casu Cyprianus in Concilio Carthaginensi,) *Expectemus universi Iudicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus & solus habet potestatem, & præponendi Episcopos in Ecclesiæ suæ gubernatione, & de actu eorum judicandi.* Non existimandus est quid sit damnatio intelligere, qui tam facile totas Ecclesias damnet, & Statanz iradat.

Ad 13. *Utrum Cranmerus fuit primus Archiepiscopus Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ?*

*Resp.* Stultissimè hoc quæri. Videat Catalogum Episcoporum, & dicat an primus sit. At qui illum antecesserunt

runt erant Pontifici, ergo defuit illi successio. Itane ? si fuissent nigri aut albi, ipse autem Rufus, an defuisset illi successio ? non magis ad ordines pertinet, an pontifex, aut græcus sit, bonus, aut malus, qui eos confert, quam si sit niger aut albus. Ordines (pariter ac sacramenta) non sunt pontificiorum aut reformatorum, sed Christi & Ecclesiæ, nec alicujus Sæctæ sed Ecclesiæ se sacerdotem professus est *Cranmerus* : ad eum finem consecratus est. Sola Quæstio est, an bene se gesserit in domo Dei, ubi œconomus constitutus erat : ut id vero innotescat, examinanda sunt quæ sequi, & cum factis missio comparanda ; si nihil non Christianum in Ecclesia statuit, satis erat illi abundè Christiana missio ad mandata Christi implenda ; asserit sciscitator noster importunus, *Cantuarienses Episcopos per novem anteriora secula pontificios fuisse*, sine fronte & veritate : cum nemo ante Anselmum de Pontificis potestate qualis nunc vindicatur, somniaverit ; cum leges Angliæ ante Thomam Becket, ut in Matthæo Parisiensi videre est ad annum 1164. potestati universalis pastoris directè contrariæ fuissent ; cum ipse *Warhamus* immediatus *Cranmeri* prædecessor, cum assentiente tota convocatione, supremam Regis potestatem in Ecclesiasticis agnovisset : quam si quis Pontificius agnosceret, erat & *Warhamus* pontificius. At si quis prædecessorum ejus aliter sentiebat, num id impediret successionem ? Respondeat Sanctus Cyprianus, qui errantes Antecessores in re maximi momenti, scilicet de aquâ vini loco in Eucharistia substitutâ, ita excusat. Ep. 63. *Si quis de Antecessoribus nostris vel ignoranter vel simpliciter non hoc observavit : potest simplicitati ejus de indulgentiâ Domini venia concedi, nobis vero non poterit ignosci, qui nunc à Domina admoniti & instructi sumus.*

Ad 14. *Utrum sit vera Ecclesia quæ non habet legitimos Pastores ?*

Resp. Quod potest esse vera : testis Ecclesia Romana, quæ

que tot habuit Pontifices Hæreticos, Schismaticos, Simoniacos, Intrusos, & Dubios, qui omnes Legitimi pastores non erant; An igitur Romæ defecit Ecclesia? possunt utram esse vera Sacramenta ubi veri non sunt Pastores, ipsa enim fatente Romanâ Ecclesiâ Fœmina & Hæretica verè Baptizat, an illa est verus pastor? Reformati veros pastores habent: inepte igitur queritur an præstat sub una specie cum Pseudo Catholicis communicare, quàm sub nullâ cum Reformatis? nullus Reformatus enim est, qui non sub duabus speciebus communicat; imo præstat illi nullum quàm mutilum Samentum, cui id vitium innotuit.

Ad 14. *Utrum 39 Articuli Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ sunt Articuli fidei vel non?*

*Resp.* Omnes non sunt; plerique negativi Articuli ad rejiciendas vel falsas vel superstitiosas opiniones exogitantur, quas alii pro Catholica fide obtrudere conati sunt; tales autem non sunt dicendi Articuli fidei: quod vel hinc liquet, si quis pro fidei Articulo vendideret, cras affore extremum judicium; qui id ad fidem pertinere negaverit, non dicendus esset novum Articulum fidei excogitasse; sic enim infiniti esse possent, & quilibet eudendi Articulam potestatem haberet. Alii inter 39 ad politiam & regimen Ecclesiæ pertinent, qui plerumque inter fidei Articulos non sunt numerandi alii sunt veritates magni momenti, quæ verò tuto ignorari à privatis Christianis possunt, imo si pertinacia absit, non credi. Alii sunt revera omnibus cognoscendi & credendi, qui soli sub nomine Articulorum fidei propriè veniunt. Quod verò inferat ille (scilicet) si non sunt Articuli fidei, ergo nemo tenetur fidem illis habere sub periculo salutis, non sequitur: potest enim salus periclitari imò amitti, pertinaciter negando alias veritates, quàm quæ propriè ad fidem spectant. Cum igitur Articuli 39 ad diversitatem opinio aut evitandam ab Ecclesiâ proponuntur, nullus qui pacem amat, illis se opponere debet.

Ad ?

Ad 16. *Utrum Religio Reformata sit divisibilis in semper divisibiles.*

*Resp.* Quod videtur istam quæstionem ut plerâq; suas à jocularibus recentium in Collegio oratiunculis mutuatus fuisse : & quod verisimilius hoc facit, solis fere illis insignem ibi sese M. M. reddidit.

Ad 17. *An in re Eucharistâ Argumentum à sensibus ductum sit fallibile ?*

*Resp.* Argumentum istud fallere non potest : ratio quam proponit dubitandi nulla est, *revera enim lignum pulchrum erat oculus, neq; oculos* primam nostram parentem *decepit* ; sed sefellit sese homo, dum serpenti potiùs quàm Deo credidit de effectu manducationis, (scilicet) quod non moreretur etiamsi comederet, de quo oculus nihil illi retulit. Credulitas itaq; non sensus primos nostros parentes decepit, caveat itaq; à credulitate, qui in quicunq; re decipi non vult.

Ad 18. *An Ecclesia Anglicana mutabilis sit ad nutum Parliamenti ?*

*Resp.* Quod non est ita mutabilis, neq; unquam ita mutata fuit : potest Rex cum Parlamento, temporalibus præmiis aut pœnis quæ sancienda sunt in Religione sancire : quis nisi mente captus hanc potestatem illis negabit ? aut quis nisi manifestò falsus plus circa Religionem reformatam Parliamentum tantâsse dicet ? Sunt igitur duo in stabiliendâ aut reformandâ Religione distinguenda : primum est, judicare de veritate Religionis, & illam quæ vera esse judicata est Christi autoritate sub salutis amittendæ periculo omnibus commendare ; alterum est, sic commendatam ab Ecclesiâ Religionem temporalibus præmiis aut pœnis munire. Primum pertinet ad Ecclesiam, secundum ad civilem Potestatem. In stabiliendâ Reformatione, Ecclesia Anglicana in Convocatione, civilis Potestas in Parlamento propriam sibi Provinciam sigillatim curaverunt.

Ad 19.



Ad 19. *Utrum spiritus Calvini negantis, ac Lutheri affirmantis corporalem præsentiam, sit uterque à Deo?*

*Resp.* Quod neq; Calvinus ab inspiratione spiritus negavit, neq; Lutherus affirmavit aliquid de corporali præsentia. Ridiculè itaq; quæritur an uterq; sit à Deo. Author Quæstionis, cum inter Fanaticos educatus esset, audivit omnia aut spiritui bono aut malo attribui, & videtur adhuc in eâ sententiâ hære; & inde somniat, non posse aliquem vel affirmare vel negare aliquid nisi ex spiritus alicujus impulsu. Quod tamen somnium, vel hoc exemplo excutiat, Paulus III. Papa affirmavit se posse Henricum VIII. imò quemlibet Regem deponere, & per Bullam idem tentavit. At M. M. (ut spero) negat potestatem deponendi Regem Angliæ inesse Papæ. Quæro igitur an spiritus utriusq; idem sit, aut an uterq; possit esse à Deo?

Ad 20. *Nonne impudentissimus fuit Calvinus usurpato sibi munere Reformandi orbem cum juvenis esset 26 annorum?*

*Resp.* Non fuit impudentissimus, impudentior enim Johannes decimus, qui Hugonem puerum quinquennem in Archiepiscopum Rhemensem & Primatem Galliæ confirmavit, ut videre est apud Flodardum Histor. Rhem. Lib. 4. Cap. 17 & 18. Impudentior Johannes Papa undecimus Sergii tertii nothus, qui studio & auctoritate matris Marozie infamis scorti & adhuc amoribus aptæ, in Vicarium Christi universalem juvenis successit. Teste Luitprando. Lib. 3. Cap. 12. Si hæc nihil ad se existimat dubitator, sciat neq; ad nos Calvinum: de quo tamen nihil inimicis credendum; non enim sibi reformandi munitus usurpavit, sed reformantibus semet adjunxit.

Ad 21. *An ex utero Reformationis effluerint cades* —  
*G. de illa civilia que emerferunt anno 1641?*

*Resp.*

*Resp.* Quod non. Cades enim rapinae & bella plus quam civilia quibusin vitas innocentium ultra omne exemplum tunc temporis saevitum est in Hibernia, ex Cleri Romani Sanguinolenta instigatione originem duxerunt. Quae vero in Anglia & Scotia nata sunt mala, non magis ex utero reformationis effluerunt, quam gladius schismata & contentiones e doctrina Christi.

Ad 22. *Utrum Africa sit feracior monstrorum, quam Britannia fanaticorum?*

*Resp.* Britannia non magis serax est Fanaticorum quam Italia & Hispania: Fanaticus est qui se divino spiritu agi aut illuminari falso credit; plures sunt ibi & in majori pretio qui hoc sibi vendicant, quam in Anglia. Fanaticus est qui ex scripturae sensu male intellecto sese legitimis pastoribus publice opponit. Tollatur *Inquisitio*, & inveniet quamlibet regionem non minus feracem esse ejusmodi fanaticorum quam Britanniam, sola igitur Inquisitio est qua melius se habent in hac parte Italia & Hispania quam Britannia: at nos malumus fanaticos quam Inquisitionem: Idque ex Christi praescripto qui in *Ezania* cum relicto simul crescere sinerent, servos jussit. Plures & magis perniciose Haereses in primæva Ecclesia ortæ sunt, pluresque fanatici, quam inter Reformatos. An sanius contra *judicium discretionis & scripturas* jam arguitur ex eo, quod eorum abusu fanatici; sunt quam contra Religionem Christianam, quod ejus pretextu tot abominandæ Haereses, quas recensent Sanctus Epiphanius & Sanctus Irenæus, orbem inquinaverunt?

Ad 23 & 25. *Quibus de legitimatione Elizabethæ & Mariæ filiarum Henrici octavi quaeritur.*

*Resp.* Elizabetham legitimam habuimus natales, utpote quæ nata erat ex matrimonio legitime cum Matre ejus contracto post sententiam divortii Paris & Casteling; vel portius postquam conjugium eorum nullum esse pro-

pronuntiatum est. Nec minus tamen Maria patri tanquam legitima succedere debuit, cum nata esset antequam verum matrimonii, propter quod nullum iudicatum est, aut patri aut matri innotuit. Filius enim natus ex matrimonio bona fide vel alterius parentis inito est vere legitimus secundum legem Civilem. Ex crassa igitur juris ignorantia nata est ista opinio, non posse & Elizabetham & Mariam legitimas esse regni Hæredes.

Sed querit & urget quæ *Authoritas uxorem suam Catherineam repudiavit Henricus?*

*Resp.* Authoritate legis Divinæ, iudicio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, cuius erat iudicare de Matrimonio infra Angliam initis, concilio sententiæ & approbatione fere omnium Cordatorum, & Doctorum istius ætatis prius habitis. At quæ Authoritate Mr M. damnat Reges & Regina Angliæ, aut de eorum jure ad Regnum determinat, ipse respondeat.

Ad 24. Utrum *laudanda sit sapientia Henrici Octavi, qui expulso uno Papa Romano infinitos Papas ex subditis suscitavit?*

*Resp.* Henricus Octavus expulit quidem Romani Pontificis usurpatam jurisdictionem secundum veteres regni leges, nullum vero Papam ex subditis suscitavit; supponit igitur quæstio falsum, & frivola est: nullus enim Papa dicendus, nisi qui jurisdictionem universalem per Ecclesiam Catholicam sibi vendicat: Quisnam est subditis Henrici id sibi unquam vendicavit? At permisit Henricus illis Scripturam, an hoc est Papam suscitare? Quot Papas suscitavit Christus, qui hoc omnibus premisit? At secundum privatum sensum Scripturas interpretari cui libet Henricus concessit: fallitur & falsus est Mr M. Nullus enim rigidior submissionis in rebus ad Religionem pertinentibus exactor à suis quam Henricus: Nemo qui

eum tantum Scripturam quem pro Catholico habebat ab omnibus amplectendum sub majori pena Curavit. Neque si hominibus tures & oculos restitueret in re Religiosa. Papas suscitasse aut Ecclesiasticam Authoritatem subvertisse dicendas esset: quod absorde & ignoranter obijciunt Papicola.

Ad 16. Si nefas sit mutare Religionem Parliamentaria Authoritate stabilitam, unde licuit Elizabethae Religionem evertere Catholica Regni legibus stabilitam?

Resp. Nefas est Catholicam Religionem quacunque Authoritate evertere; neque Catholicam Religionem sed Romanam Elizabetha mutavit; quae vi & fraude stabilita, jure totius regni & majoris & senioris partis Ecclesiae consensu everta est; oculos enim fallacis imptis, tyrannide & vivicombustis innocentium reddiderat. Hinc facile ad abrogandas leges & civiles poenas quibus ista religio flecterat, Parliamentum senect accinxit: nec difficilius (sancitis Canonibus Ecclesiasticis) reformatam Religionem stabilire Ecclesiae persuasum est. Nec aliter nec melius veritas stabiliri in nostris regnis potest. Ejusmodi constitutionem & stabilimentum Romanae Religionis in Anglia vel ipsius infallibilitatis iustitiam Pontifex redimeret: at sine vi, sine fraude & fallaciis ut hoc fiat desperandum esse novit, & inde est quod in tot facies se vertit.

At quaerit quomodo poterant jurare Elizabetham esse caput Ecclesiae, quando non poterant jurare eam esse caput Regni?

Itane Petrus III. quam regnum, quam leges, quam nascendi jus, quam omnes orbis Principes, & ipse tandem Papa pro legitima Regina habuerunt, solus pro spuria impune rejiciet? Qui talia audet, perdidit cum religione frontem, & cum sensibus & ratione iuravit & omnem exuit sese modestiam. Fuit itaque Regina caput Regni:

Regni; ut vero caput Ecclesie eam esse plenis iuraret,  
nec lex iussit, nec in his verbis *Elizabetha* exigat. Qua-  
tuordecim equidem Episcopos sedibus expulsi, & mē-  
do recusatum iuramentum primum, quod ipsi excogi-  
taverat, quod toties susceperant, & quod strenue sub pa-  
tre & fratre propugnauerant, sed non auctoritate sua so-  
la non inauditos expulsi, ad Marini Episcopos quibus suc-  
cesserant: neque recusantes igni mandandos mandavit, ut  
Maria; sed è contra leniter illis tractavit, illisque uti  
vellent vivere permisit, unde nihil contra Reginem vo-  
luerit, aut contra reformationem, sui non conscientia  
sed pudore prohibuit, ut plurimum consequi noluerunt.  
Quod vel ex eo colligi potest quod cum Episcopis in eo-  
rum sedes surogatis pacifice, plenis vixerant, neque alios  
præter reformatos sibi successores constituisse. *Abi tu &  
fac similiter*, ut illi cum audirentur, neque audirentur.



*Tumaces & delinquentes Gladio civili coercent.* Sive igitur Clericus sive Laicus si qui civili Gladio puniendus est, solus Rex est qui infligendi poenam istam habet potestatem. Imò etiamsi Clericus ille aut Laicus propter hæresin aut aliam quamcunq; causam quam maxime spiritualement ista poena esset mulcandus; neq; hoc est omnimodam obedientiam tam religiosam quam civilem Regi præstare testat enim Ecclesiæ suæ potestas spiritualis integra, nempe verbi, sacramentorum & spiritualium poenarum distributio. Quicunq; igitur excommunicandus est, propter quamcunq; causam, ab Ecclesiâ non à Rege est isti censuræ subijciendus. Satis igitur constabit iurisdicção quam Regi tribuimus sine clavi potestate, totaq; secundum Articulum prædictum spectabit ad gladium civilem. Cum dicatur igitur Regem esse unicum gubernatorem, tam in spiritualibus quam temporalibus, intelligitur illum esse unicum temporalem gubernatorem, cui jus gladii in omnibus rebus tam Ecclesiasticis quam temporalibus competit, & qui solus Iudex est supremus, quando & quoties uti debet eâ potestate. At concessio, omnimodam obedientiam quæ homini præstari potest nos illi debere, quomodo sequitur quod inferit M. M. quod oportet nos cum *Calvinianis* esse *Calvinianos*, *Arianos* cum *Arianis*. Annon cives Romani totam istam obedientiam, quam per hoc iuramentum vendicârunt nostri Reges, Papæ præstare tenentur? An igitur oportet eos, cum Hæretico, Papa aut Schismatico, Hæreticos aut Schismaticos esse? Quia Papa est unicus illis supremus gubernator, tam in omnibus spiritualibus quam temporalibus. Nos vero quæ Regis sunt Regi tribuimus, reservatis Deo quæ sunt Dei. In omnibus Regi vel passivam vel activam obedientiam præstare solemur; & si quando inter Regem & subditos orta fuerit æquiditum sit quod impetatur, necesse est quemlibet pro se Iudicem esse, nec ulla

ulla hic fomes bellorum civilium, id enim vitabitur si modo vel activa vel passiva obedientia præsteretur. Quod contra hanc Doctrinam affert facile diluitur (scilicet) *tum Regem non supremum esse sed Scripturam & statuta*, non enim scriptura aut statuta sunt gubernatores, sed suprema regula secundum quam Regi est obediendum. Ut vero questionem questione rependam, videat, An se tam facile expediat? Si quando lis inter Ecclesiam & civilem potestatem orta fuerit, quæro quis inter illas erit Judex? Si Papa investituræ Episcoporum, verbi gratia, immunitatem Clericorum, provisiones & appellationes sub censuris decreverit, repugnantemq; Regem excommunicaverit, quis de gravibus his causis inter illos judicabit? assignandus Judex, nisi mavis illos in æternum altercari, quis quæso erit Judex inter concilium Papale & Comitæ Regum?

Ad 29. *Cur Reformationem tam avide amplexi sunt tot Nobiles. sub Elizabethâ?*

- Resp. Nihil ad nos cur amplexi sunt, quidam Christum etiam ex invidia prædicarunt. Sperabit vero meliora quilibet qui charitati non valedixit, præsertim cum meminerit quot viros scientiæ celebres, concilio graves, fortitudine claros, pietate insignis protulit ista ætas, quâ neq; prior aliqua ætas felicior, nec quam posterior forte æquabit. Nulla tot viris claruit quibus patria & respublica cordi erant, quibus ista vitiorum seges ignota, quæ præsentis ætati incubuit. Inimicus est Anglorum fame virtuti & armis qui aliquid vel suggereret, quod tot heroum gloriæ obesseret, quorum virtuti patria debet, quod supra Garamantas & Indos, & ad usq; sidera nota est. Novimus quid jam facit Nobiles, & è Nobilibus papicolas: spondeat ille pro omnibus qui jam Papismum amplectuntur, & ego vicissim spondebo omnes Nobiles sub Elizabethâ non lucri sed Conscientiæ gratia reformationem amplexos.

Ad

Ad 30. *Cur plebs Anglicana novitatis avida edit Papif-  
num?*

*Resp.* Propter crudelitatem, fallitatem, tyrannidem  
& novitatem, quæ omnia native Anglorum genio re-  
pugnant; non enim (ut falso insinuat) Anglicanæ plebs  
novitatis avidior quàm quælibet alia gens. At Religio  
est quibusdam, patriam odio, patrios mores fastidio,  
& populares, calumniis prosequi: qui peregrinorum  
morum & rituum miratores, quicquid externum est  
quasi verum & vetustum magni faciunt. Illa enim  
religio, quæ sensum & rationem naturalem tollit,  
naturalem etiam in patriam & amicos affectum subver-  
tit.

Ad 31. *An Ecclesia Anglicana fallibilis sit vel infalli-  
bilis?*

*Resp.* Particularis Ecclesia licet in se fallibilis, quamdiu  
tamen se observationi præceptorum divinorum accingit,  
& mediis quæ Deus illi indulgit induritur, id est  
quamdiu veritas illi usui est, neque falli neque fallere er-  
rore aliquo saluti pernicioso potest: idemque de quolibet  
Christiano dicendum. Dum autem actu non fallitur licet  
fallibilis fundatur super Petram: qui enim super eam fun-  
datus non est, salvus esse non potest.

Ad 32. *De Ligno Scientiæ & Vitæ, aliud responsum  
non meretur præter verba Christi, qui malum facit odie  
lucem, lignum scientiæ non erat lignum vitæ, at in eodem  
Paradiso simul confita sunt à Deo; quæ conjunctæ Deus  
maledictus qui dividit.*

Ad 33. *Nemo in Ecclesiâ Anglicanâ desideratur versio  
Biblicarum, multo emendatior & correctior?*

*Resp.* Versio Biblicorum Anglicana emendatior est vul-  
gari Latini versione, licet nihil est ab omni parte per-  
fectum. At non vult Romana Ecclesia emendatorem, sed  
nullam in vulgari idiomate versorem. An non præstet

igitur, nobiscum versione minus correctâ mi, quam cum Romanis nullâ ? mentitur, ubi assertit in versione nostrâ vitari tentus, in favorem carnis, & gratiam schismatis : quod productis ab ipso exemplis patet.

*Gal. 5. 17.* Ut à nostris vertitur, nec faveat carni, nec schismati. An favere dicendus est carni, qui dicit hominem dum carne ducitur omnia quæ vult spiritus non posse facere : esto tum carni favebat Sanctus Paulus qui *Rom. 8. 7.* de Carne affirmat quod *hominis Dei non est subiecta nec esse potest, qui autem in carne sunt Deo placere non possunt.*

*Dan. 4. 24.* Caldæis exacte respondent unde nostra est versio, si igitur conformis sit origini, non mutamur nobramur vulgarem Latinam, cuius tamen non alius sensus est in hoc loco, quàm quem verba Anglicana forant.

*1 Cor. 7. 9.* *ΕΙ ΔΕ ΟΥΚ ΕΠΕΡΑΤΕΥΟΝΤΑΙ* de illis dicitur, qui sui potestatem non habent ; ita Sanctus Theodoretus, qui ad hæc verba hæc paraphrasi utitur, *Sin autem cupiditatis impetum ferre non potestis, sed ad sustinendum certamen imbecilli animo estis, nulla lex prohibet quò minus Matrimonium contrahatis.*

Item Sanctus Anselmus apud Lyram, Qui propter mentis imbecillitatem non possunt continere carnis impulsione, nubant.

Item Lyra, id est, Si donum continendi non acceperint à Deo.

Item Commentarius sub nomine Sancti Ambrosii, Quid si impulsu carnis perseverare se viderint non posse : An hi omnes fuisse carni & schismatici dicendi sunt, eo quod nostræ versionis astipulantur ?

Idem dicendum est de *Matt. 19. 11.* *ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΟΥ ΧΑΡΕΤΑΙ*, omnes non capaces sunt, vel propter socordiam vel propter impotentiam, quid hoc ad indulgentiam carnis ? An Christus indulgebat carni cum sese explicans addit :

addit secundum vulgarem Latinam (videlicet v. ejusdem  
Capituli 12.) qui potest capere, capiat.

Joh. 7. 1. Exacte Hæbræis verbis respondent, & si  
marginem inspicias, Latinis.

Exod. 20. 4. Recte redditur ab Anglis interpretibus,  
nec à vulgari discrepa, quæ non idolum sed sculptile red-  
dit: sculptile vero non melius Anglicè reddi potest,  
quam ut habent nostra Biblia; nec aliud per idolum in-  
telligebant 70. quam imaginem ad cultum fabrefactam:  
unde plurima exemplaria substituunt. TAYLTON Deus. 5.  
8. idem igitur ΕΙΔΩΝ & ΤΑΥΤΩΝ; nec aliter reddi-  
tur à Gallis & Italis, quorum alteri in Catechismis vulga-  
ribus reddunt *Image Taillée*, alteri *Image Sulpita*. Ut  
videre est in *Diario de S. Amour*, Parte 3. cap. 5. ubi hæc  
ipsa quæstio coram Cardinalibus discutitur: frustra igitur  
in versionem nostram insurgit, quæ dubium est an sin-  
cerior extat. Nihil adhuc momenti contra Ecclesiam  
nostram protulit, si quid habeat proferat tandem; & Ar-  
gumentis non quæstionibus, rem agat. Meminerit enim  
quis sit, qui plures ejusmodi proponere posset, quam quas  
facile solvat sapientior.

FINIS.